Vol. LV. No. 1 July, 1916

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

BX
801
E17
V.55

CONTENTS

THE GOOD SHEPHERD PSALM 1
The Rev. JOHN SIMON, O.S.M., Mount St. Philip, Granville, Wisconsin.
STATE SUPERVISION OF CATHOLIC INSTITUTIONS 14
The Rev. JOHN O'GRADY, Ph.D., Catholic University of America.
MICHAEL PURTELL'S ENGAGEMENT 19
The Rev. WILLIAM J. McGUCKEN, S.J., St. Louis University, Missouri.
CONVERSION AND REVIVALS 28
The Rev. P. A. FORDE, Dubuque, Iowa.
SHAKESPEARE AND CATHOLICISM 48
ELBRIDGE COLBY, New York City.
BLESSING THE SCAPULAR MEDAL 73
IRREMOVABLE RECTORS 76
CATHOLIC LAWYERS AND DIVORCE CASES 77
RENEWAL OF MATRIMONIAL CONSENT 78
IS THE BISHOP OBLIGED TO CELEBRATE IN THE CATHEDRAL? 79
DISPENSATION FROM RECITATION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE 80
TWO CEREMONIES: IS THE MARRIAGE VALID? 82
DANCING PARTIES UNDER "CATHOLIC" AUSPICES 84
CLERICAL DRESS 87
TRANSLATION OF "MATER AMABILIS" 87

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
1305 Arch Street THE DOLPHIN PRESS Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1916: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price. United States and Canada, $3.50; Foreign, 15 shillings ($3.65)
London, England: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row Melbourne, Australia: W. P Linehan, 309 Little Collins St.
Entered, 5 June, 1889, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

St. Bernard's Seminary O-Neh-Da Vineyard

ALTAR WINE

ON account of the increased cost of labor and of materials used in shipping Altar Wines and of a recently imposed government tax we find it necessary to revise our prices as indicated below.

We take occasion to call attention to the reliability of the wine and to its superior qualities. The wine is made according to the rules of the Church **under the personal supervision of the Right Reverend Thomas F. Hickey, Bishop of Rochester, who gives his guarantee to the purity of the wine.** It is both licit and valid matter for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Revised List—Spring of 1916

GRADES AND PRICES

Ordinary Altar Wine, made from Concord, Catawba and Worden grapes,
Bottled, 5 gallons in 25 bottles ..... $ 8.00
In bulk, 1 keg 10 gallons. 12.50
In bulk, 1 keg 23½ gallons..... 27.00
In bulk, 1 barrel 46 gallons 50.00

Elvira Altar Wine, made exclusively from the Elvira grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 9.00

Superior Altar Wine, made exclusively from Delaware, Brighton or Salem grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 16.00

War Tax Additional. **No Dealer has this Wine for sale.**
Kindly advise method of transportation – Freight or express.

Address all communications to REV. M. J. NOLAN, Chancellor, 72 Frank Street, Rochester, N. Y.

ALTAR WINES BEYOND DOUBT

L'Admirable $6.25 per dozen

Novitiate $5.00 per dozen

Malvoisie $4.00 per dozen

Villa Joseph $4.00 per dozen

War Tax Additional

(Copy) **SACRED HEART NOVITIATE**
Los Gatos, Cal., January 3rd, 1916.

THE BARNSTON TEA COMPANY, 6 Barclay Street, New York City.

Gentlemen: It is with pleasure that, looking over our books, we observe that during the year 1915, we have shipped you in sealed cars, the following quantities of our altar wines:

13,252 Gallons ..... Sweet Novitiate
6,012½ Gallons ..... Villa Joseph
3,843 Gallons ..... Malvoisie
103 Gallons ..... L'Admirable

We take the present opportunity to thank you for your conscientious and painstaking efforts made in handling our wines, the results of which are so gratifying.

For the coming year we have the greatest hopes; we have in our wineries an abundance of excellent wines, made by our own brothers and whose absolute purity we can therefore guarantee. Should your requirements for the coming year double or triple those of last year, we are confident that we can meet them.

Thanking you once more for your efforts made in selling our wines, and wishing you every success during the ensuing year, we desire to remain,

Yours very sincerely, THE SACRED HEART NOVITIATE,

John P. Madden, S.J.

Treasurer

Sole Eastern Agents

Barnston Tea Company, 6 Barclay St., New York, N. Y.

MR. J. W. DONNELLY.

The Donnelly Brothers

Established 1870

Valid and Licit ... Altar Wines

Our wines are popular because of their proven purity and agreeableness for use when fasting

Collegiate ..... Mellow and fruity
Jurancon ..... Delicate and delicious
Vin de Tours ... Generous and full-bodied

A trial order solicited. Satisfaction guaranteed.
Please address

The Donnelly Brothers TRO N. Y

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:

De Erectione Provinciae Reginensis, divisione Dioecesis Sancti Bonifacii et Erectione Archidioecesis Winnipegensis 65

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII:

I. Decretum circa Imagines exhibentes Beatissimam Virginem Mariam indutam vestibus sacerdotalibus 68

II. Declaratur Dubium circa Indulgentiam Christianae Salutationis: "Laudetur Jesus Christus" 68

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS:

I. Decretum circa quasdam choreas in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis et in Regione Canadensi 69

II. Declaratio circa Clericalis Vestis Usum in Regione Canadensi 70

ROMAN CURIA:

List of Recent Pontifical Appointments 72

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 73
Blessing the Scapular Medal 73
Ringing the Bell at Benediction 74
Ablution of Fingers at Lavabo, when there is No Server 75
The Sign of the Cross in blessing Beads, etc. 75
Irremovable Rectors 76
Catholic Lawyers and Divorce Cases 77
Renewal of Matrimonial Consent 78
Is the Bishop obliged to Celebrate in the Cathedral 79
Dispensation from Recitation of the Divine Office 80
Two Ceremonies: Is the Marriage Valid? 82
Admission of Children to First Holy Communion 83
Dancing Parties under "Catholic" Auspices 84
Clerical Dress 87
Translation of "Mater Amabilis" 87

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Martindale: Life of Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson 88
Howlett: Life of Father Charles Nerinckx 94
Farrugia: Tractiones Tres—De Censuris 97
———: Plain Sermons by Practical Preachers 98
Griffith: Meagher of the Sword 99
Coghlan: Passion and Death of Jesus 100
Barraud-De Ponte: Meditations on the Mysteries of Our Holy Faith 100
Gavan Duffy: Yonder? 101
Bridges: The Spirit of Man 103

LITERARY CHAT 105

BOOKS RECEIVED 109

ENRICH YOUR LIBRARY

WITH A

SET OF THE REVIEW

OF RECENT MONTHS there has been quite a brisk turn-over of back copies of the REVIEW. We have been advertising for some numbers to help complete the files of some of our subscribers, and they are still in search of other back copies. If you need some back copies or volumes, or if you have them to dispose of, now is the time to write.

+ + + +

The increased activity in this department is doubtless due to the publication of the INDEX of the first fifty volumes of the REVIEW. The INDEX has proved itself a most useful volume, both for those who have all the volumes of the REVIEW and those who have only a few volumes. Subscribers who have not yet got a copy of the INDEX can procure one ($3.00 postpaid).

+ + + +

Priests who want early volumes of the magazine will do well to send in their requisition without delay. It is impossible to say from day to day what copies or volumes we shall have on hand to-morrow. At this writing we may have the numbers your set lacks or we may be able to get the missing copies for you. Let us know what you need or what numbers you wish to dispose of.

+ + + +

Start to build your set of REVIEW now. It has been a pleasure to us to help complete the sets of several of our subscribers, and we shall gladly try to do it for you. What more valuable for a priest's library than a set of the volumes of the REVIEW ?

TO-DAY, SEND FOR BACK COPIES, AND INDEX

BX
801
.E17
v.55

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. V.—(LV).—JULY, 1916.—NO. 1.

THE GOOD SHEPHERD PSALM.

FATHER FABER'S statement that men's daring impulses about God are often nearer the truth than their more slow-footed calculations, could have for its basis the Twenty-second Psalm, "Dominus regit me". For, the latter's bold yet tender utterances, which originally might have been mistaken for mere poetical hyperbole, eventually were realized by an almost literal restatement from the mouth of the God-Man, in the familiar Good Shepherd figures of the Gospels.[1] Moreover, its description of the mutual interrelation of God and man, instead of remaining barren and unfulfilled—as did the Pharisees' humanly reasonable concepts of a materially glorious, regal Messias—has, since its composition ages ago, deeply affected thousands of hearts, borne consolation to tearful souls, and above all has inspired the virtue of resignation and confidence amid suffering, that power irresistible of those who are helpless.

Hence a brief analysis of this Divine and at the same time supremely literary poem may not be unwelcome to the clerical reader who is accustomed to recite it at Prime of a Thursday morning.

HEBREW TEXT.

The Hebrew text is reproduced below in an arrangement which will more clearly visualize the strophic order for the modern reader's eye. As the Massoretic pointing has been changed in one letter only (v. 6*a*), I omit it here. The Roman numerals at the side indicate the logical strophe divisions; the figures refer to the verses of the Vulgate.

[1] See Luke 15:4-6; Matt. 18:12; John 10:11, 14-15, 27-28.

	מזמור לדוד	(א)
I	יהוה רעי לא אחסר	
	בנאות דשא ירביצני	(ב)
	על-מי מנוחת ינהלני	
	נפשי ישובב	(ג)
II	ינחני במעגלי-צדק	
	למען שמו	
	גם כי אלך בגיא צלמות	(ד)
	לא-אירא רע	
III	׀ ׀ ׀ ׀	
	כי אתה עמדי	
	שבטך ומשענתך	
	המה ינחמני	
IV	תערך לפני שלחן	(ה)
	נגד צררי	
	דשנת בשמן ראשי	
	כוסי רויה	
V	אך טוב וחסד ירדפוני	(ו)
	כל-ימי חיי	
	ושבתי בבית יהוה	
	לארך ימים	

TRANSLATION.

The translation here attempts to parallel as closely as may be the metrical form of the original. Departures from the literal text are explained in the appended notes. The Roman numerals at the side refer to the logical strophe divisions, the others to the verses of the Vulgate.

(1) A HARP-SONG BY DAVID.

I The Eternal being my shepherd, I shall not want,
(2) for in lush-grassed pastures he will make me lie down;
Beside tranquil waters will he bring me;
(3) he will refresh my soul.

II Along level pathways will he lead me,
according to his name.
(4) Yea, tho I enter a death-gloomy valley,
no harm shall I fear!

III * * * * * * *
for thou art with me:
Thy crook, thy shepherd's staff,
will make me feel secure.

IV (5) Thou hast spread a table before me
to spite my harassers;
Thou hast perfumed my head with ointment,
my goblet overfloweth ever.

V (6) Truly, goodness and favor pursue me
all the days of my life.—
Therefore the house of the Eternal shall be my home
for length of days!

ANALYSES.

Literary. The color-tones of this Psalm are few and simple, yet rich and warm. It is in truth a small but delicately wrought cameo of inspired poetry. Rhetorically considered it is composed chiefly of two extended metaphors taken from ordinary scenes of Semitic life: that of the careful shepherd tending his flock (strophes I-III); and that of a generous host giving hospitality to a fugitive stranger (strophe IV).[2] There is marked progress of poetic intensity: in strophes I and II the composition is merely historical; in the next two it rises to fervent apostrophe, climaxing in the first distich of strophe V, and ending fitly in a beautiful reflexive conclusion.

Metrically, the Psalm is built up of half-line couplets, a pair forming a strophe (*Doppel-Halbzeilenpaar*), according to Haupt. Each couplet has three rhythmical stresses or beats in the first half-line, and two in the second (as Ps. 109 and Jonas 2: 2-10). The parallelism is chiefly synthetic, dividing the composition into rhythmically complementary portions, though between the couplets themselves we can hear also the finer thought-cadences of synonymic parallelism, like faint musical overtones.

Logical. The object of the Psalm is to acknowledge and praise the care and generosity of Divine Providence toward the Psalmist, or toward mankind in general.[3] In the first

[2] Hengstenberg would have the whole Psalm describe the shepherd's care for his flock. But thus the second figure is unnaturally strained. The objection that, according to the view advocated above, the pastor's duty of feeding his flock is not emphasized, is futile: sheep need only green grass and fresh water, not wine in goblets nor set tables. *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, art. "Psalms", in trying to carry out the pastoral figure, gives us this strange translation in v. 5: "My trough runneth over".

[3] St. Athanasius, St. Thomas, and Calmet, however, connect the literal sense with the return of the Exiles.

three strophes the Psalmist shows how God is always hovering over him in tender watchfulness, supplying needs, removing difficulties, and guarding against all harm. In the fourth strophe he repeats the same ideas more forcibly under another figure, emphasizing the generosity of God in His dealings with men. The first couplet of the fifth strophe elegantly sums up all that precedes, and the last gives in conclusion the response of a grateful heart which, since it cannot repay, will praise the Divine Friend's favors as much as it is able.

Prophetical. There is not sufficient evidence that this Psalm was primarily intended to refer to Christ, to warrant classifying it definitely as Messianic, though the association of the shepherd figure with the Messias must have been quite familiar to the Jewish mind. The language and ideas, indeed, often strikingly parallel those of some of the Messianic prophecies. Here are some characteristic examples of the latter: "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather together the lambs with his arm, and shall take them up in his bosom, and he himself shall carry them that are with young."[4] "Thus saith the Lord God: I myself will seek my sheep and will visit them . . . and I will feed them by the rivers . . . in the most fruitful pastures . . . in the high mountains of Israel; there shall they rest on the green grass."[5] And the Wise Man says that the words of wisdom which we have received through "the counsel of masters", official leaders and teachers, have been "given from one shepherd".[6] Later Jewish writings also connect the shepherd idea with the Messias. Thus we read in the Seventeenth of the Psalms of Solomon (63-48 B. C.):

> He will pasture the flock of the Lord
> in faith and justice:

[4] Is. 40:11; compare with Luke 15:17.

[5] Ez. 34:1-31; see also 37:24.

[6] Eccles. 12:11.—The Midrash on Numbers, sec. 21, has been quoted as interpreting v. 5 of this Psalm messianically, but the Rev. P. Schaffel of St. Francis Seminary (to whom the writer is indebted for kindly criticism) does not consider this certain. The text in question, as interpreted by him, reads: "God said to the Israelites: 'In the days *of the world to come* I will prepare before you a table, and the Gentiles will see and will be confused, as the Psalmist says,'" etc. Nor does Vigouroux enumerate this Psalm among the Messianic ones.

He will let none of them want
in their places of pasture.
He will lead them in holiness:
no proud one among them shall oppress them.[7]

Mystical. With the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, this Psalm may be taken typically to represent Christ's tender and bountiful care for His chosen souls, or for the members of the Church. Thus the beautiful pastures are the Church; their fresh, rich grass, the true doctrines of faith or the Sacred Scriptures, that nourish the mind after it has been brought out of the barren, dreary wilderness of sin or unbelief. There, too, man's will is strengthened, "lest it faint in the way", by quiet, cool waters—graces that flow so tranquilly and so refreshingly into the soul.

Along straight, though perhaps narrow, paths does the Divine Shepherd guide us by His wholesome laws and counsels, which, as we ever realize more and more, are after all sweet and easy, "according to His name"—"My yoke is sweet and my burden light". And even when life's way leads through some gloomy, danger-fraught valley, some great affliction of body or mind, some dread trial wherein crafty men or demons threaten our temporal or eternal welfare, like so many fierce wolves or silent, deadly serpents, do we not put all our confidence in the shepherd's staff of God's providential power, that He will therewith put our threatening assailants to flight?

The rich table, the inebriating chalice, have universally been understood of the sacramental feast of the Eucharist, whereby we poor sinners are admitted to Divine intimacy and, though all dust-covered from the fight, are strengthened again for life's battle against our spiritual enemies, by partaking of the Good Shepherd's own Body and Blood, as St. Thomas prays so beautifully in the *Lauda Sion*:

[7] Baumgartner, *Weltliteraturgeschichte*, I, p. 165. Of interest in this connexion is also a remarkable passage of the Book of Henoch: "I saw a lamb, and this lamb became man. And it built the Lord a sheepfold, and it gathered therein the sheep that had been lost. I also saw a lamb which went before the one that led the rest, fall. And I saw a great number of other sheep perish, and their young grow up in their place and enter upon a new pasture. And the lamb that led them, which had become man, departed from them and died. And the other sheep sought and called for it with pitiful cries" (88:60-63, in op. cit., p. 168). The symbolic allusion to John the Baptist and to Christ is unmistakable; too much so to be Jewish!

Very Bread, Good Shepherd, tend us,
Jesu, of Thy love, befriend us;
Thou refresh us, Thou defend us;
Thine eternal goodness send us
In the Land of Life to see.

NOTES.

Author and Occasion. The title of this Psalm ascribes the authorship to King David. According to the Biblical Commission the historical correctness of the Psalm titles—usually witnesses of most ancient Jewish tradition—cannot be called into question when no grave objection has been brought against their genuineness.[8] But no internal or external evidence of weight has been brought against the genuineness of this title. Consequently the Davidic authorship must be maintained.[9] This conclusion is confirmed by several facts: the Psalm is one of the First Book, which is almost unanimously ascribed in its entirety to David; it contains (v. 6) a sentiment most characteristic of this king, namely, that of praising the Eternal in His central dwelling-place in Israel,[10] according as he had himself signified,[11] and as might be expected of him as the institutor of the Levitical choirs.[12] Finally, the high literary excellence of the lyric well befits the "egregius psaltes Israel",[13] and the beautiful pastoral figure applied so intimately to the speaker certainly emanates naturally from an author who has been a shepherd himself.

Although one might see in v. 5*a* a local allusion to the incidents related in I Kings 25:25, or II Kings 16:1, or 17:27, yet the whole tone of this Psalm seems to point to a spontaneous outpouring of David's soul in his more reminiscent old age, at some time after the Ark had been brought into the

[8] See *Com. de Re Biblica*, 1 May, 1910, in ECCL. REVIEW, July, 1910, pp. 93-94.

[9] According to Paul Haupt (who is often too intent on representing the two war-riven centuries before Christ as a most flourishing period of Hebrew literature), this Psalm is Maccabean, having been composed in 165 B. C. (*American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XXIII, p. 225.) An objection of Ewald's is solved in note on v. 6.

[10] Ps. 5:8; 25:8, 12; 26:4; 29:13; II Kings 22:50.

[11] II Kings 6:22.

[12] I Par. 16:4, 41; II Par. 23:18.

[13] II Kings 23:1.

"City of David",[14] when all his people were in peace and plenty, or after he himself had been favored with some special interior strength or sweetness by God.

Textual Comment. Strophe I, v. 1. "The Eternal": this paraphrase probably comes nearest to conveying the idea at the root of *Yahweh,* the proper name of God as the God of the Jews.—"Being my shepherd": the Vulgate here seems to wish to tone down the anthropomorphism of the original—V. 2. "Lush-grassed": *deshe,* means the first tender green sprouts in which flocks delight.—"Lie down": *rabats,* is used specifically of quadrupeds; the Septuagint has κατεσκήνωσεν, from idea of encampment; Henricus Stephanus, "accubare me facit".—"Tranquil waters"; Septuagint: ἐπὶ ὕδατος ἀναπαύσεως, "beside water of rest": the reference may be either to noon encampment for rest, or to quiet, smooth flow of stream.—V. 3. "Refresh": literally: "restore", "bring back", as we say "*re*create".—"My soul": Hebraism for "me".

Strophe II, v. 3. "Level paths": that is, not over difficult, steep, rough mountain roads; *tsedek,* means "straight", "right", primarily in physical sense; the Septuagint and the Vulgate have given the secondary, ethical signification to point the allegory directly.—"According to his name": as becomes His benign character, or "for his name's sake",—as Martini notes: not by any merit of ours but purely through His benevolence.—"Death-gloomy" (Todtdräuendes Thal): literally "valley of the shadow of death", that is, a deep, dark cañon, lonely and terrible, with chasms and wild beasts threatening death.

Strophe III. According to Bickell and Vigouroux the first hemistich of this strophe has been lost. And, in fact, the *Halbzeile* with which the strophe now begins, *ki-'atháh 'imadyí,* has only two rhythmical stresses, instead of three which it should have in the metrical scheme adhered to quite faithfully throughout the rest of the poem. The parallelic balance of the whole composition may be saved by assuming that there has been lost from the first part of this strophe a three-stressed hemistich, perhaps containing ideas like the following: No wolves shall set upon me, or: I shall not perish

[14] II Kings 6:12; I Par. 15:16.

in the pits. This hypothesis would also dispense with many a hard-wrought explanation [15] of the following line, "Thy crook and staff shall make me safe." A cudgel was the ordinary weapon of shepherds in warding off the attacks of wild beasts from their herds. David himself had no sword when herding his father's sheep,[16] and the weapon to which he was best accustomed was a sling.[17]

Strophe II, v. 5. The Psalmist now declares the kindness and generosity of God under the figure of a patriarchal host feasting a persecuted stranger. To offset all the calumnies or attacks suffered from enemies, the fugitive is exceptionally honored by God, so that he is no longer troubled by their assaults, but rejoices in the richness of the banquet. It was a mark of special favor to have perfume poured on one's head at a feast—a courtesy studiously refused our Lord by the Pharisee, Simon.[18] Oriental politeness likewise requires that a guest's goblet be always kept well filled with wine.—"My goblet": the Septuagint and many of the Fathers have "Thy chalice". But the Vulgate and Massoretic reading of the pronoun is supported by St. Jerome's translation.—"Overfloweth ever"; the translation seeks to express the idea of the original by a verb; but the Massoretic text has only: "An abundant (or, consequently, inebriating) potion". The Septuagint adds ὡς κράτιστον, the "quam praeclarus est" of the Vulgate. The reason for this may be that the Greek interpreter, not knowing well what to do with the short and obscure phrase, *kōsi rewayah*, thought to obtain a clearer meaning by connecting it with the first two words of the following hemistich, *'ak tōb*, according to the current pointing, thus giving us the interjectional predicate complement "Most excellent!" But St. Jerome and the whole rhythmical and grammatical context support the Massoretic division, which joins these words to the following strophe. The Sinaiticus and the Venice and the Complutensian editions also put the equivalent Greek phrase into v. 6.

[15] Examples of these are: that the sheep somehow are consoled by chastisement with the rod, or that the latter supports them.

[16] I Kings 17:35.

[17] I Kings 17:40.

[18] Luke 7:46.

Strophe V, v. 6. Although the adjective *tōb* can exceptionally be taken in a neuter form to have a substantive meaning, the context here seems to require the pointing *tūb,* giving us the substantive "benignity, goodness" commonly found in similar adjuncts in the Psalms.[19] This reading agrees better with the other member of the subject, *chesed,* and seems also to have been St. Jerome's.—"Pursue": Calmet calls attention to the Oriental custom of sending food from the royal table to favorites of the king.[20]—"The house of the Eternal": Ewald draws his objection to the Davidic authorship of this Psalm from this phrase, on the assumption that *beth Yahweh,* necessarily means the Temple, as in Ps. 121:1. As this difficulty occurs also in several other places, it will be worth while examining it here more at length.

First of all, in indisputably pre-Solomonic compositions we find *beth Yahweh* used to designate the Tabernacle or sacred tent of the Exodus and of the early sojourn in the Promised Land.[21] On the other hand, it is to be noted that the proper name of the great Temple, *hekal Yahweh,* is several times applied to the Covenant-tent.[22] In the Twenty-sixth Psalm especially we find the above and other synonymous expressions all used conversively of the Tabernacle. That it is really the latter that is meant, is evident from the fact that in a series of honorific appellations the lowest in degree cannot itself be lower in genus than the object modified. But, the lowest of this series is *sok,* (in *qeri*), which is properly a "wattled hut". Evidently, then, it is not the Solomonic Temple which is referred to. From this we may conclude that the mere mentioning of a "temple" is not of itself sufficient proof that a biblical composition is of post-Davidic origin.[22]

"Will be my home": some of the Fathers have "et inhabitem", others, "ut inhabitem"; the Vulgate joins both, "et

[19] See Ps. 24:7; 26:13; 39:20; 144:7.

[20] See II Kings 11:8; Dan. 1:5.

[21] Exod. 23:19; 34:26; Josue 6:24; I Kings 1:7 (Vulgate "templum Domini"), 24; 3:15; Judges 18:31 (*beth Elohim*). The last sentence of the verse just quoted, as well as the last phrase of the preceding verse are, of course, later glosses.

[22] I Kings 1:9; 3:3; II Kings 22:7; Ps. 5:8; 26:4; 28:9.—Even Maas says (*Life of Christ,* p. 120, ed. 1892): "Probably he [Abiathar] was then ministering in *the temple* with his father" (I Kings 21:1-9). *Hekal* literally means "a great house", or "the house *par excellence*", and may thus be applied to any dwelling of God.

ut inhabitem". Either word translates the Hebrew conjunction.

Is the Psalmist's fervent prophecy and our Lord's sweet promise being even to-day realized? Ask the "little ones" of Christ, faithful, simple, lamb-like souls that live always under the shadow of God's wings, with the clear light of His countenance ever over them, and the sweet perfume of His garment wafted about them in unexpected, silent times and places, feeling the soft pressure of His sustaining hand beneath their drooping heads just when pain or suffering would fain crush them to the ground. Such as these can tell how the Good Shepherd Psalm is being fulfilled.

J. SIMON, O.S.M.

Mount St. Philip, Granville, Wis.

STATE SUPERVISION OF CATHOLIC INSTITUTIONS.

DURING the past quarter of a century there has been an increasing tendency to emphasize the power of the State as a means of expressing and defending the interest of its citizens as a whole. We have seen the power of the State invoked to protect women and children against unreasonably low wages, abnormally long hours, and unsanitary working conditions. We have seen its power invoked to secure assistance for dependent widows with children. We have also seen its power invoked to secure proper compensation for the victims of industrial accidents and for those dependent upon them. The laws passed for the purpose of securing these various objects, while apparently interfering with the right of a private contract, are based upon sound social policy, inasmuch as they are necessary in the interests of public health and morality. As the State intervenes in order to protect the interests of its citizens as a whole in regard to the conditions of the labor contract, so also may it intervene in order to express and uphold the common interests of the community in regard to charity.

There are certain forms of charity which can be carried on by the State more effectively than by any private institution. The State can make more adequate provision for tubercular

cases, for the sick poor, and for dependent widows with children than can any private organization. In regard to the public regulation of these forms of charity, there can be no question. But after the State has done its part there still remains a large field to be covered by private charity. The resources of private charity organizations may be devoted to taking care of the poor in their homes or to the erection and maintenance of institutions for dependent and delinquent children. No matter what form private charity may have taken, it must be admitted that it has developed some of the finest qualities of the race; that it has developed some of the noblest types of men and women that the world has ever known. Rarely do we meet an official in our State institutions who devotes himself so whole-heartedly and so zealously to caring for delinquents and dependents as do the Sisters and Brothers in charge of our orphanages and reformatories. "In a Roman Catholic institution," said a recent speaker at the National Conference of Charities and Correction, "the splendid devotion of the men and women, who, without hope of material recompense, give their lives in unstinted service to God and their fellows, creates an asset which cannot be duplicated in other creeds."

Nobody questions the high motives actuating Catholic or other private organizations engaged in the field of charity. Most people admit that, without them, we would have very little charity in the real sense of the word. People, however, are beginning to ask the question nowadays: What should be the relation of these various forms of private charity to the State? They are beginning to ask, whether or not the State should exercise any supervision over them, and if so, how much? With regard to the question of the public supervision of relief-giving organizations we are not particularly concerned in this article. It may be said, however, in passing, that in most cities at the present time there are indorsement committees of citizens who pass on all charitable institutions appealing to the public for support. Some years ago, the city of Cleveland passed an ordinance requiring all charity organizations collecting funds from the public for relief purposes to obtain an indorsement from a committee composed of the representatives of private charities, the Chamber of Com-

merce, and the public at large. In reference to the public supervision of private institutional charities and especially of institutions caring for dependents and delinquents, there has been considerable discussion in recent years. Most people, who have had any experience in charity work, contend that some form of public supervision of private institutions is necessary. It is contended in the first place that the State has an interest in children in institutions, as these children are its future citizens. Secondly, it is claimed that public supervision is necessary in order to keep the institutions up to a reasonable standard of efficiency. Most institutions, like most men, tend to fall into routine methods of doing business. They tend to look more to systems than to their results. The fact that they have been employing certain methods of institutional care for a number of years they deem a sufficient proof of the efficiency of these methods for all times. Thirdly, it is claimed that State supervision of some kind is necessary for the elimination of institutions which do not possess the necessary facilities to take care of dependent children. Fourthly, public supervision of private institutions is necessary in order that the State may have an accurate idea of the number of its dependents and delinquents and of the facilities which it possesses for taking care of them.

In discussing the question of State supervision of private institutions, two kinds of institutions are usually distinguished, namely: institutions receiving public appropriations either in a lump sum or on a contract basis, and those receiving no public appropriations. It is apparent that the public should have more to say concerning the former institutions than the latter. When the public contributes money for the maintenance of its wards, it has a right to know how the money is expended. It has a right to see that it is turned to the uses for which it was intended. This argument, however, cannot be used exclusively in regard to institutions receiving public appropriations. All private institutions are, in a sense, public beneficiaries. By reason of the public service which they discharge, the State exempts them from taxation. It has, therefore, a right to see that they discharge their social function in a proper and reasonable manner.

In the discussion at hand we are too much inclined to emphasize the benefits accorded private institutions by the State. After all, the central point of the whole problem turns upon the question of social policy. How far may the State go in regulating private charities without preventing their proper and wholesome development? Nobody wants to see institutions masquerading as charitable, and appealing to the public in the name of charity, unless such institutions are capable of doing at least fairly efficient work. On the other hand, nobody wants to see an obstacle placed in the way of the development of charities which do a real public service. The really charitable desire, in their work, to give free rein to their altruistic impulses, and are very much opposed to being lectured to by outsiders who frequently are not sufficiently influenced by the same high motives. Our Catholic Brothers and Sisters do not want to be eternally pestered by public officials, telling them how they should run their institutions. They do not want to have public officials impose their standards upon them, for they feel that their long experience enables them to work out standards of their own which are better suited to their own conditions. At the same time their isolation tends to make them narrow, self-satisfied, and too much attached to traditional methods. They frequently look upon public officials as theorists who know little about the practical details of institutional work. This frame of mind, which is in evidence in some Catholic institutions, is not at all to be recommended. It is a great obstacle to the introduction of more modern methods of child-care in these institutions. Public supervision, if carried out in a sympathetic and friendly manner, can do a great deal toward removing this obstacle. The Brothers and Sisters in charge of our Catholic institutions may be convinced, but they cannot be forced, to improve their methods of institutional care. In visits of the writer to Catholic institutions in different cities, it was gratifying to find that the Sisters are beginning to realize the necessity of raising the standards. This is due in part to the counsel and advice of public authorities, in part to the broader social education of those in charge, and in part to the influence of diocesan officials. In New York and Brooklyn especially, a great deal of the improvement in Catholic child-caring

institutions may be traced to the zeal and sympathetic co-operation of the diocesan officials.

Before discussing the question of how far public supervision of private institutions ought to extend, and what things it should include, it may be well for us to have some general idea of the present law and practice in the different States. So far as the writer is aware, the principle of State supervision of private institutions in one form or another is recognized in sixteen States, namely: Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, District of Columbia, Missouri, Minnesota, Michigan, Kansas, Indiana, Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, California, and New Hampshire. New York is the only State in which supervision is confined to institutions in receipt of public appropriations. In most of these States public supervision of private institutions is purely nominal. Before beginning their work the institutions are generally required to take out a license which must be indorsed by the State Board of Charities. In addition to this the State laws generally specify that each institution shall make an annual report to the State Board of Charities or the State Board of Control, as the case may be. This report must give an account of income and expenditures of the institution, and also of the number of children admitted and dismissed during the course of the year. Some States, such as Illinois and New York, exercise a rather detailed supervision over private institutions. In Illinois, the State Board of Administration is charged with the duty of inspecting child-caring institutions. The agents of the board visit the institutions, without previous notice, five times each year. The matters to which they pay especial attention in their investigation are: sanitation, food, sleeping quarters, educational facilities, and system of child-placing. If the board finds that the work of a particular institution falls below the minimum standard of efficiency, and sees no immediate hope of improvement, it may withdraw the certificate of that institution at the end of the year and thus discontinue its business. The New York law specifies that the representatives of the State Board of Charities shall make an annual investigation of all institutions receiving money from the public. The important points to be covered by this investigation are: (1) capacity of insti-

tution, the census, ages, and classification of inmates; (2) administration of institution; (3) general condition of building, of dining-room, school-rooms, play-rooms, dormitories, heating, ventilation, etc.; (4) fire protection; (5) educational facilities provided for children; (6) moral training and discipline; (7) provisions for physical training; (8) health of children, and medical care; (9) clothing of children; (10) dietary; (11) record-keeping. When the representatives of the State Board of Charities discover any notable defects or abuses in a private institution, the matter is referred to the representative of the particular religious denomination of the institution on the Board. This member of the Board communicates with the head of the institution and tries to have the abuse corrected or the defect remedied. Last year the Department of Public Charities of the City of New York concluded that the work of the Board of Charities was not sufficiently effective to bring the child-caring private institutions of the city up to the best modern standards. An advisory Committee was therefore appointed to investigate these institutions and to make suggestions in regard to the necessary improvements to be installed by them. The first act of this Committee was to draw up an elaborate questionnaire to be used in visiting these institutions. This questionnaire led the investigators to inquire into every detail of institutional life. Nothing that could, in any way, affect the physical or moral welfare of the children was overlooked. The investigators tried to find out what kind of records the institutions kept and whether these records contained a complete social history of the child before it entered the institution; or in the case of children who had been dismissed, whether it recorded what disposition had been made of them. Secondly, they tried to get an itemized account of the income and expenditures of each institution. Thirdly, they tried to find out what provision the institutions were making for the physical health of their inmates, both as regards medical service and recreation facilities. Fourthly, they attempted to discover what the institutions were doing for the bodily care and comfort of their inmates. Under this section were included dormitory facilities, bathing, toilet, and lavatory facilities, dining-room equipment, food, table manners, and clothing. Fifthly, they

inquired about the discipline of the institutions and about the various forms of sanction in vogue therein. This represents but a mere outline of the questions asked by the representatives of the Department of Public Charities in the course of their visits to private institutions last year.

The standard set up by the New York Department of Charities represents an ideal for which we should strive in our institutional work. It is, however, an ideal which we cannot expect to attain in a week or a year; for the very good reason that we are, as yet, unable to ascertain the expense which it will entail. One may say that our institutional wards have a right to the best that society can give. Emphatically, yes; but so have our sweat-shop workers; so have the thousands of women workers in the country, who are at present receiving less than a living wage. Every one knows that there is a large number of workers in this country who do not get what society can afford to give them or what they have a right to, in strict justice, according to the accepted standards. What is true of the weaker classes of the community in general in this regard is equally true of institutional wards. We may have very high ideals in regard to institutional wards, but we shall have the greatest difficulty in getting others to make the necessary sacrifices for the attainment of these ideals. The attainment of high standards in our institutions entails an expense which people are, as yet, unwilling to bear. The State cannot, therefore, expect private institutions to come up to very high standards if there is not some means or other of providing the necessary funds. There are some theorists in this country at the present time who advocate the adoption of the cottage plan by all child-caring institutions. This would mean that the children would be divided up into groups of twenty-five or thirty and that each group should have its own separate building. A great deal has been said about the success of the cottage plan, as adopted by certain institutions in New York City; but it should be remembered that such institutions take care of only a small number of children and with a very large income. We know of one such institution which takes care of about two hundred children with an annual income of seventy-eight thousand dollars. It is very unreasonable to expect large

congregate institutions, which provide for five times the number of children, to adopt such an expensive plan. It is very unreasonable also to criticize large institutions in the light of this ideal system of child-care.

Independently altogether of the cost, it does not seem to us a good social policy to have the State suddenly impose its standards upon Catholic institutions. Our Catholic institutions have been doing things in certain fixed ways for centuries. They have certain traditions which are hallowed by centuries of experience. These settled traditions make them hesitate before accepting new and little-tried experiments. Herein lies their strength and their weakness. Their attachment to the traditional methods makes them oppose the introduction of any standards of child-care which might not be in harmony with Catholic ideals; it prevents them from going to unnecessary expense in introducing new methods whose soundness has not yet been fully established. On the other hand, their reverence for the traditional methods sometimes makes Catholic institutions unreasonable in their opposition to new ideas in child-care. As has already been noted, the best means of overcoming this unreasonable attitude is by the use of moral suasion. The long experience of those in charge of Catholic institutions should be taken into account by the public officials. The Catholic Sisters and Brothers should have a voice in regard to the standards of child-care in their institutions. They surely should know as much about child-care as persons who have spent only a few years in the study of sociology; and it is from this latter class that inspectors of institutions are most frequently drawn. The trained sociologist and the person with actual experience in institutional work have much to learn from each other. The sociologist knows the theory of child-care. He can bring the results of psychology and physiology to bear on institutional work; but he is inclined to forget the limitations of his theory as applied to the actual running of an institution. By coming into close contact with persons engaged in institutional work he can find out how theory and practice harmonize. He can discover how difficult it frequently is to apply theories to actual life.

From the foregoing discussion, certain general conclusions may be drawn in regard to public supervision of private child-caring institutions:

1. Some form of public supervision of private institutions is necessary in order to keep them up to certain minimum standards. The State has a right to see that persons desiring to establish institutions have the necessary training and facilities for their work. A number of people maintain that the State has a right to say whether or not a particular institution is necessary. In other words, they maintain that the State has a right arbitrarily to limit the number of institutions doing a certain form of charity work. Such an extension of the power of the State is not based on sound social policy. The public authorities should not restrain the charitable impulses of the community except in so far as may be necessary for the prevention of abuses. We need all the real charity we can have nowadays. Although we may be great believers in efficiency methods and very much opposed to useless expenditure of energy, we should be careful not to do anything which would, in any way, interfere with the proper development of the charitable impulses of the people.

2. The supervision of private institutions should be carried out in a sympathetic and friendly manner. The public officials to whom the task is committed would do well to remember that their duty is not to criticize and find fault, but to give counsel and direction. They should not, therefore, be unreasonable in their requirements.

3. Certain minimum standards ought to be enforced in all child-caring institutions. The State ought to insist on all institutions making proper provision for the health of their inmates. The children ought to have a reasonable amount of medical attention. Every institution should be compelled to have on its staff a reputable physician whose business it would be to examine children on their admission, and as frequently thereafter as may be necessary to acquaint himself with their condition. The physician should also be consulted in regard to the food and the physical exercise of the children.

4. Children in institutions ought to have as good educational opportunities as those in the parochial and public schools. The older children ought to have a chance of securing a high

school education, and as far as possible, facilities should be provided for vocational training.

5. Every private institution ought to be required to make an annual report, which should indicate, in a general way, its income and expenditures; the number of children admitted to, and dismissed from, the institution during the year. The report should also tell what disposition has been made of the children dismissed.

The power of the public authorities ought to be limited to the securing of these minimum standards of institutional care. There is no good reason why they should have unlimited powers of prying into the details of institutional work. If, however, they are kindly and sympathetic, they may do a great deal toward improving institutional standards. Those in charge of private institutions are, as a general rule, willing to listen to reason and may be prevailed upon to make desirable improvements, if the representatives of the public are tactful in their dealings with them. It is because of their lack of tact and sympathy that the work of so many supervisors of institutions has proved a dismal failure.

JOHN O'GRADY.
The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

MICHAEL PURTELL'S ENGAGEMENT.

"FATHER PAUL," said my sister Ellen plaintively, "I wish you would say a word to Teresa Grogan. Her carryings-on are getting beyond me."

"Teresa Grogan, eh? Which precept of the Decalogue has she broken now?" I inquired carelessly as I poured the cream over the breakfast food that Ellen provides for me. I cordially detest these new-fangled dishes, but Ellen insists that they're good for me.

My sister Ellen is a good deal of a tyrant, I'm afraid. But that's her nature—God bless her! I sometimes think that had Ellen been born among the idle rich, she would have made a first-rate suffragette, so convinced is she of the utter incompetence of the male sex to manage things. Fortunately she has been preserved from that fate, to preside over the destinies of my household. Preside is the word, I can assure you!

Every curate I've had has been deathly afraid of Ellen, and for my part, while I do not like to admit that I fear her, nevertheless I respect her dictums very highly. Ellen has a very strong motherly instinct that is usually expended on myself and my assistants. My present curate, little Father Stephens, calls it a grandmotherly instinct.

One damp day as he was going out for a constitutional, Ellen called out sharply and somewhat stridently from an upper window, "Father Stephens, have you got your rubbers on?" The little man was wroth at heart, especially when he heard the Campbell girls across the way giggling unrestrainedly, but—he came back for his galoshes.

However, this is not to be a story about Ellen; it is about Teresa Grogan. Teresa had invaded the peaceful precincts of the rectory some six months previous, armed with a letter of introduction from a priest in Tipperary, a cousin of mine, asking me to keep an eye on his parishioner, Miss Teresa Grogan, to secure her a position with a Catholic family, and so on, with the usual quota of banalities down to the "Yours faithfully". As Ellen had summarily dismissed the hired girl—I beg pardon, Ellen calls her the maid—the day before, Teresa's arrival was most opportune. She entered our service at once.

Since that date, I had had little peace. It was Teresa Grogan this and Teresa Grogan that; Teresa talked too long to the iceman; Teresa spoiled the roast; Teresa didn't get up on time; Teresa kept the janitor from his work with her palaver, and so on and so forth *ad infinitum*. Every morning after Mass, I was obliged to eat my breakfast to the accompaniment of Ellen's recital of Teresa's misdemeanors. Why Ellen tells me of the servants' troubles and asks me to speak to them, I shall never know. She is perfectly aware that they are not in the least bit intimidated by me, and that they are all in mortal terror of her. I fancy that she wants to keep up the pleasant fiction that I, as pastor, am the real head of the house. And I always acquiesce in the fiction, as in fact I do in nearly everything Ellen says or does.

So on this particular morning I waited patiently for Ellen to unburden herself of her griefs.

"Father Paul," she said sternly. (This is another of Ellen's pet hobbies; she has never called me plain Paul since the day of my ordination.) "Father Paul, Teresa has been flirting, actually flirting with the policeman. And flirting from this house, too! I saw her deliberately raise the window and wave a duster at him as he passed."

"But, perhaps," I protested weakly, "it was only a coincidence after all. Maybe she just happened to raise the window when he was passing. Let's not judge the poor girl rashly."

"Coincidences don't happen day after day and even several times during the day," she remarked dryly. "I shall send Teresa to you after breakfast and see to it that you give her a good straight talk."

"Very well, Ellen. I'll do my best to convince Teresa of the error of her ways."

"Did ye want to see me, yer reverence?" asked Teresa about a half hour later.

"Ah yes, Teresa. Just a little point of information. Could you tell me the name of the policeman on the beat?"

"Policeman, yer reverence?" She blushed furiously. "What policeman?"

"Why, that ugly-looking fellow with the red hair that's on the day shift," I said carelessly.

"Ugly-looking is ut?" rejoined Teresa bridling. "Faith, 'tis manny a fine gintleman in yer parish thin would be afther envyin' Michael Purtell his fine build an' carriage, if I do say ut!"

"Soho!" I chuckled, "you do know him after all. Well now I hope that no girl in my parish, especially one who holds the very important post of assistant housekeeper to the priest, would think of—ah—flirting with any gentleman, no matter how handsome."

"Flirtin' did ye say?" resentfully. "Herself," with a jerk of her thumb toward the upper regions, "herself's been tellin' ye tales. Well, ye can inform Miss Ellen O'Connell what I never'd tell her, though she tried hard enough to find out, that I was interdooced, interdooced, mind ye, to Mr. Michael Sarsfield Purtell by Miss Norah Coulihan who's a member

of yer own Altar Society. An' ye can tell Miss Ellen O'Connell, too, that he is a dacint man come of dacint Kerry folks who minds his own business an' don't tell lies to blacken the reputation of innocent girrls. Which is more than I can say for some people!"

With this she flounced out of the room, a picture of righteous indignation. Later in the day I sent for her.

"Teresa, you say he's a good Catholic? Does he belong to our parish?"

"No, yer reverence, he boards wid his uncle out to St. Columbanus's on the west side. But he do come to Mass here sometimes. An', yer reverence, it ud do yer heart good to hear him talk about yer preachin'. He thinks you're the graandest man!"

The sly little minx; she knows my weak points. After this attack what could I do but approve of her policeman, who, I learned, was really a splendid fellow. In deference to Ellen and the proprieties, I forbade Teresa to wave at him from the windows. I gave her permission, however, despite Ellen's horrified protests, to go out with him Tuesday afternoons and have him come up to see her Sunday evenings after services. They say all priests are inveterate matchmakers and I suppose I am no exception to the rule.

I met Michael Sarsfield Purtell frequently thereafter. He was a great hulk of a man as bashful in my presence as my youngest acolyte. But the great laugh of him; not one of your coarse tavern guffaws; but a laugh that is first cousin to the plashing waterfall and that steals its music from the chimes of some Old World cathedral. It began in a queer little grimace that would never pass for a smile on any face but an Irishman's; it grew and grew until the whole countenance was wreathed in impish smiles; and finally ended in a burst of melody that was a joy to hear. To be brief, Michael had the merriest laugh and the merriest, most honest face I had seen in a month of Sundays. And the frank eyes of him, with their clear limpid depths, like his own Kerry lakes, beggar description.

I grew to like the big boy—after all, despite the brass buttons, he was little more—and often used to chaff him just to hear his laugh ring out. Teresa was very proud of the fact

that I admired her officer, and often of a Sunday evening she would come in from the little back parlor where she was entertaining Michael, curtsey primly and say: "Yer reverence, wouldn't ye like to see *Mister* Purtell for a minute, please?" And of course, I'd go.

On one occasion I said to the couple, "Well, Mr. Michael, I suppose you'd like me to officiate at your wedding, but Teresa here, I'm sure, would want the curate. Old men aren't so stylish, are they, Teresa?"

Michael looked very sheepish and Teresa turned crimson.

"'Deed an' ye know, Father, that I'd have no one but you to marry me. But, av coorse, as I've often told yer reverence, I'm not thinkin' of marryin'. Who knows," she added with mock gravity. "I might join the sisthers."

"You might," I replied laughing, "and you might not."

The next day, while Teresa was arranging things in my study, she said reproachfully, "Yer reverence, ye nearly spoiled everything last night. I'm not promised to Michael, ye know. He hasn't asked me yet." This last was said very wistfully.

"Soho! That's why you're threatening him with becoming a sister is it? O you daughter of Eve! You child of deception! Well, well, let him take his time, girl; if he's not blind and made of stone, he can't long hold out against your siege."

Just then Ellen came in.

"Father Paul," she said severely, "I don't think you should allow Teresa's young man to come here courting unless he declares himself. You know how often you have preached against the evils of long courting. And he's been tagging after the child for six months now; high time he was declaring his intentions."

"My dear Ellen," I answered wearily, "you're an angel and angels rush in where mortals fear to tread. I got that quotation mixed; well, let it stand anyway. Maybe the young man doesn't want to embark on the stormy seas of matrimony; maybe he hasn't the passage money yet; maybe a thousand and one things, my dear sister; but what concern is it of ours, after all? If he were courting you, my dear, it might be a different thing; I might be called upon to act."

Moreover I was confident that the little romance in my back parlor would end happily to the merry tune of wedding bells. Trust Teresa for that, thought I! It was only the bashfulness of my friend Michael that was delaying the denouement.

One Sunday night about a month after this conversation, I noticed that Teresa was with my sister in the sitting-room; Michael was conspicuous by his absence.

"Teresa," I called.

The girl came into my study. I could see her eyes were red with weeping.

"Where's Michael?"

"How should I know, yer reverence?"

"You know very well, miss. Tell me, have you given him the mit—pardon me, have you refused Michael?"

"No, yer reverence," bravely but almost tearfully.

"Why isn't he here to-night?"

"I told him not to come round here. I niver, niver want to see his face again."

And she burst into a storm of passionate weeping. After the sobbing had subsided, I asked:

"Why did you tell him that?"

"Because—because—he goes round with an Eyetalian wumman an' I told him I'd niver have annything to do wid annyone who went around wid Dago wimmin. So there."

"Teresa Grogan," I said sharply, "What Italian lady are you talking about?"

But Teresa went to her room sobbing. Ellen came in to explain.

"It's just this, Father Paul. That young man of yours"—mark the words, mine—"that young man of yours has been a gay deceiver. *I* knew it all along. Last week Teresa saw him taking a young Italian woman, and a very pretty one, too, into Terracino's bakery across the way. It seems she is living with these Terracinos; some relative, no doubt. Teresa very properly wanted to know who she was and this young man refused to explain. Said he couldn't yet. Couldn't, indeed! He wouldn't—that's the reason. And trifling with Teresa's affections in this shameful fashion all these months. I saw

him myself go into the bakery several times the past week. There's something rotten at the bottom of the whole affair."

"My dear Ellen, there you are with your rash judgments again. The Terracinos are perfectly respectable people and, as you yourself have told me, go to the Italian church every Sunday. Moreover, I shall not easily believe anything wrong of Michael."

"Believe it or not, Father Paul, but you mark my words—he's a gay deceiver."

The next day she came in triumphant. There's nothing some good women love better than to say I told you so.

"Father Paul," she said excitedly, "I've just come from Terracinos and they told me that the young woman is *Mrs. Purtell.* No less! That she's been married several months. That she's a cousin of Mr. Terracino. And there you are. And this villain coming here all these months, playing the double-dyed deceiver."

"Ellen Elizabeth O'Connell," I exclaimed in horror, "did you go out and gossip at the bakeshop?"

"No, indeed! Not I. I merely asked very casually who their new boarder was and they told me. But they must suspect something, too, because Mrs. Terracino said, 'She's only married three months; it's very sad.' Of course I didn't ask any further questions. Perhaps she meant that it was very sad that the young woman wasn't living with her husband. Some reason—no good one, you may be sure—keeps Michael Purtell from living with his lawful wife."

Poor Teresa! The evidence seemed to be against her Michael. I sent for her and tried to cheer her a bit.

"Keep a brave upper lip, Teresa Grogan," I said, "and show that you've the blood of Irish kings and queens in your veins. And remember this, there are just as good fish in the sea as ever there were."

Poor little girl! She went round the house like a lost soul the next few days. Fortunately the annual mission began the following week, and she was kept busy answering the door-bell, and waiting on the missionary fathers.

Toward the end of the mission, while I was out walking with one of the priests, I met Michael. He tipped his hat as usual, but so forlorn and dejected was his appearance that I

hadn't the heart to give him a severe look as I should have done by right. He looked as if he wanted to speak, so I stopped and asked,

"Everything all right, Michael?"

"'Tis an' tisn't, yer reverence. I'd like to come up and talk wid ye about something that's bothering me, if it won't be inconvenient to ye, Father."

"Certainly, Michael. How about to-night—eight o'clock, say?"

"All right, Father, I'll be there. An' thank ye." He hesitated. "How is Teresa, yer reverence?"

Well, this was too much. A married man to ask about the girl whom he had jilted. I drew myself up stiffly. "Miss Grogan, I daresay, is quite well, thank you," I said, and passed on.

That evening Teresa came into my study as pale as a ghost.

"Yer reverence," she faltered, "Mister Purtell is in the parlor wid the Eyetalian wumman. An', yer reverence, what d'ye think that thief of the worrld said to me. *I* wanted bygones to be bygones. So I showed him an' the Eyetalian into the parlor widout a worrd. I tried to remember what ye said about the kings and queens of Ireland. Well, just as I was comin' out here, he coughs an' sez, 'Teresa,' sez he, 'I want ye to meet Mrs. Purtell, my ——' But I rushed out widout even lookin' at the pair of them. The brazen cheek of him! Faith, thin, Father, I hope the banshees will haunt him an'—"

I quieted the girl and went into the parlor. I'm sure I had the severe look on my face then. Michael was like a statue of misery in repose. He didn't have on his uniform and policemen never ought to appear in civilian's garb. They look too much like fish out of water. Teresa's "Eyetalian wumman" was a rather pretty Neapolitan and I could easily see how she had captured the great heart of Michael. Ah, Teresa, if you had only been born in the sunny south, you never would have permitted her to steal a march on you.

The two were certainly not a very affectionate couple for newly-weds. A fly in the amber somewhere, thought I. Perhaps the lady has not yet learned how to cook corned beef and cabbage or perhaps Michael hasn't learned the intrinsic merits of the succulent spaghetti.

"Well, Michael," I said rather stiffly, "what can I do for you?"

"Yer reverence," Michael began awkwardly, "Beeatreesay here was married before the squire an' as she's a Catholic she wants to know if she can't be married before the priest. Her—"

"Michael Sarsfield Purtell," I exclaimed horror-stricken, "you were married before a justice, you with the blood of Ireland's saints in your veins! I'm thoroughly ashamed of you. Where was your faith?"

I paused for breath. Michael looked thoroughly bewildered and abashed. But the Italian woman, Beatrice, smiled knowingly, displaying incidentally her dazzling white teeth.

"Padre, you aire leetle bit meestaken. He say *I* am married before the justees, not heem. He not married"—she giggled "he lofe the Signora Teresa."

"Bless my soul!" I said, rubbing my glasses. "Here is a puzzle indeed! Michael Purtell, are you married or are you not?"

"I am *not,* yer reverence," came from the astonished Michael.

"Who then is this lady?"

"Oh, Beeatreesay, she's married to my brother, Tim—at least, they went before the squire. Tim's a bad lot, Father; he was sent to the Bridewell for thirty days—disturbin' the peace, yer reverence. Beeatreesay had to come an' live wid her cousins the Terracinos an' I used to bring her letters from Tim."

"Michael, Michael, I'm so glad!" I almost shouted. "But, why, oh, why didn't you tell us about it and not have us making all sorts of wild conjectures about your conduct?"

"Sure, yer reverence, I didn't have a chanct. Teresa told me she wouldn't ever talk to me again because she saw me with Beeatreesay. You wouldn't be afther havin' me tell her about Tim, would ye? He's the first of the name to bring disgrace on us. Besides" (in a whisper) "I weren't exactly proud of being brother-in-law to a Dago, an' that no real brother-in-law in the eyes of the Church. Tim gets out a week from to-day and he and Beeatreesay wants to be married right. I fixed that," he added significantly. "I thought

maybe you could do it, Father. It ud give Tim a new start, maybe."

"I'll see, Michael, I'll see. Just a moment, please."

Forgetting all about my clerical dignity, I dashed wildly out to the kitchen and found Teresa crying her eyes out. I gave her a fine lecture on rash judgment and then explained matters. I returned to the parlor and sent Michael out to the kitchen, as, of course, I had to discuss several details alone with Mrs. Timothy Purtell (née Terracino). Several times I was distracted by the sound of that welcome laugh of Michael, rich, whole-souled, the music of which I can not easily forget.

No, there wasn't a double wedding; the Church does not easily dispense with the banns. Moreover, those things only happen in fiction. In real life, I've observed, the bride doesn't want to share the glory of her great day with any one. But, Teresa and Michael did act as witnesses at Tim's marriage. After the ceremony, Teresa actually kissed her "Eyetalian wumman". And my bashful Michael actually kissed Teresa, to the great scandal of Ellen. I am sure, however, that Michael thought it was part of the ceremony.

May is not so far off now and Teresa insists "'Tis the only month of the year to be married in, Our Blessed Lady's own month." Consequently Ellen is beginning to look round for a new maid. She says she is going to secure a plain reliable one this time; what she really wants, as I tell her, is an old maid like herself.

WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, S.J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.

CONVERSION AND REVIVALS.

THE sensational campaigns of Billy Sunday cannot be ignored. If we can believe some fairly impartial witnesses, he seems to be "delivering the goods", as he would say himself. He seems to differ from most other "Evangelists" in the respectful attitude he adopts toward the Catholic Church. One never sees in published accounts of his sermons anything like the fantastic doctrines of Martin Luther. His preaching may offend good taste; his language may be more

attuned to the sporting arena than to the pulpit; but his doctrine, so far as it goes, seems to be of the sound old-fashioned Christian kind, untainted by the Protestant tradition in its positive aggressive aspect, though it is, of course, lamentably deficient when considered from the Catholic point of view.

Revivalism has figured prominently in the history of American Protestantism. It is associated with the names of Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield, with the Presbyterians and the Methodists, with the foundation of Princeton University and the initiation of the Chautauqua lectures, and thus by devious paths it brings us face to face with President Wilson and Mr. Bryan. In his *History of the American People* the President shows himself cold and sceptical in reference to the alleged benefits of "The Great Awakening" of American Protestantism, initiated by Edwards and Whitefield in the 'thirties and 'forties of the nineteenth century, even though the admirers of that movement may fairly claim that out of it came the zeal for Christian education that led to the foundation of Princeton. Catholics may share this scepticism to some extent, especially when they bear in mind that Protestant Revivalism often has issued in a new outburst of No-Popery fanaticism, with its exhibition of that peculiar kind of Protestant piety that is manifested in the burning of convents and the smiting of Papists hip and thigh by frenzied mobs of the saved. This is how the Ulster Scot, whether in Belfast or in Kentucky, usually shows that he has "got religion", and in all probability we are not expected to reckon it as one of the amiable characteristics that secure for his hyphen and for his hyphen alone the tolerant sympathy of the President.

If we turn from Princeton to Harvard, we find that the late Professor James was singularly attracted by the subject of religious conversion, especially among the Protestant Evangelical bodies; and he devoted to it two of the most interesting of his Gifford Lectures on "The Varieties of Religious Experience", delivered in the congenial atmosphere of Edinburgh in the years 1901-1902. Professor James derived some useful material for his studies of the subject from *The Psychology of Religion,* written for the Contemporary Science Series by Professor Starbuck of the University of California.

Mr. Harold Begbie has written his *Twice-Born Men* and *Souls in Action* to illustrate the doctrines of Professor James; he confines his attention to the case of converts made by the Salvation Army in the worst slums of London. But when one observes the difficulty some officials of our public libraries experience in deciding where exactly to place Mr. Begbie's books, whether in the Scientific, Psychological, Sociological, or Religious department, one begins to realize the varied interests of the whole subject.

If one accepts as genuine the narratives of real conversion given by James, Starbuck, Begbie, and others, there arises an interesting problem for Catholics. Can men be converted from sin to grace by that Lutheran faith which is proclaimed as their peculiar doctrine by the denominations which call themselves Evangelical? This doctrine is the very Gospel that gives them their name. Is it a real force for the conversion of sinners? What is its real meaning, when, if ever, it helps to bring souls to God?

This theological problem merges in a historical one, when it compels us to study the fate and fortune of Luther's cardinal doctrine, "doctrina cadentis vel stantis ecclesiae". When we find Professor James telling his Scottish audience that from Catholicism to Lutheranism, then to Calvinism and Methodism, there was visible progress of spiritual religion; that Catholic theology nowhere speaks so straight to sick souls as Luther did in his Commentary on Galatians, we find that we are very far indeed from the dry bones of dead-and-gone heresies. Some of these controversies never grow old. It may be that the Luther-legend alone is responsible for the survival of many unintelligible and absurd formulas, as Father Mausbach suggests, in his work on *Catholic Morality and Its Opponents*; but there is something deeper than that at work when our Harvard Professor finds that the Evangelical process of Conversion and the New Birth is quite in accord with the latest results of modern Psychology.

Conversion is a turning from sin to grace, from the creature to the Creator. For the sake of clearness we may omit the consideration of the Sacrament of Baptism, and confine ourselves to the case of the adult sinner. We may also pass over the case of sudden conversions, like that of St. Paul, or that

of the Jew Ratisbonne at Rome in 1842. Professor James is mistaken in the particular attention he bestows upon such cases; for they utterly baffle all analysis, theological or psychological. They are secrets between God Himself and the individual soul, and the soul finds herself unable to give an adequate account of her wonderful experiences. What usually takes place in the case of the adult sinner who returns to God is sufficiently described by the Council of Trent in the decrees on Justification. Our theologians have elucidated the doctrine of this chapter to a satisfying degree, and their elucidations may be found in popular form in our Catechism and still better in the Preparation for Confession in our prayer books. There is an admirable and profound study of the whole subject in the fourth chapter of Mohler's *Symbolism.*

The Council describes the change that takes place when a sinner is converted, as a change from that state in which man is born a child of the first Adam into the state of grace and adoption of the sons of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ our Saviour. This change means more than the mere external pardoning of sin; it means sanctification, a renewal of the inner man by voluntary reception of the sanctifying grace and the supernatural gifts of God, as a result of which a man from being unjust becomes just, from being God's enemy becomes His friend and so heir, according to hope, of eternal life.[1] This is real conversion; it is the work of the hand of God upon the soul of man. Man has no claim of his own to it. It is a free gift of God earned for man by the merits of the sufferings and death of Christ. But man is not idle during the process. Stimulated by God's inspiration, awakened by the Holy Ghost, aided all along by his Creator, he freely takes his own part in his conversion. He obeys the Divine Command which means so much to him and to all students of this subject: "Turn ye to Me and I will turn to you." In Chapter VI the Council gives the usual steps of the process—faith, fear of Divine Justice, hope, the beginning of love, hatred of sin, sorrow, purpose of amendment, reception of the Sacrament *in re vel in spe.* Mohler beautifully explains the connexion and interdependence of all these dis-

[1] Ch. VII.

positions, and shows how they culminate in and lead up to that love which is the crown of all, as faith is the beginning, the root, and the foundation.

Now Luther's personal contribution to theology was his dogma of justification by faith alone, with all that it implies. He denied that the converted sinner is really changed in the depths of his being; the sinner remains essentially sinful, foul with a foulness that even Luther's vocabulary is inadequate to depict. The sinner merely has Lutheran faith, that is, he trusts that his sins are forgiven him for Christ's sake. This trust at once verifies itself. He is justified the very moment he believes that he is justified. He thus grasps the holiness of Christ, and, clad in it as in a mantle, he is seen by the all-seeing eye of God to be holy with an imputed holiness. In other words, he believes what he knows to be false, and this belief induces Omniscience to confirm his delusion and to ratify it. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the absurdities and the blasphemies inherent in this new gospel. The origin of it is a matter, mainly, of pathological interest; Father Grisar's gentle handling of the subject will not remove the correct impression made by the emphatic language of Father Denifle, just as it did not secure for the Jesuit more courteous treatment at the hands of the modern victims of the Luther-legend than was meted out to the outspoken Dominican. The wonder is how such a gospel could create such a legend and influence so deeply and so widely the whole course of history and thought, from Calvin to Kant and from Kant to William James. Scarcely more striking is the fate which has befallen the new gospel, which was the sole plea for the break with historical Christianity in the sixteenth century.

According to the Protestant Sell, no Protestant layman to-day as much as knows what Luther meant by faith and justification, and no Protestant theologian, knowing what he meant, agrees with him. The Lutheran gospel is quite dead. What a Norwegian convert, Krogh-Tonning, calls "The Silent Reformation", has been at work in the very heart of Protestantism, with the result that Protestants who are really Christians at all, now hold the very doctrine of the Council of Trent, which was formulated in express contradiction and condemnation of the wild fancies of Luther. Some steps in

this process of silent return from Luther to Christ are of peculiar interest. I refer to the great movements that are identified with the names of Philip Jakob Spener, Count Zinzendorf, and John Wesley. The historical importance of these movements, their far-spreading influence, the personal characters of the leaders, entitle them to our consideration; but of particular interest is the light they throw upon the problem of conversion from the point of view of Catholic theology.

Ritschl, whose own system of subjective sentimentalism has affinities with the Pietistic point of view, still insists that Pietism, as it appeared in Lutheran and Calvinistic circles during the seventeenth and the eighteenth century, *is an abortion of Protestantism, caused by the false Catholic ideal of piety.* This interesting avowal is quite in harmony with the attitude of the official guardians of Lutheran orthodoxy toward Pietism when it first appeared on the stage of history. Philip Jakob Spener, who originated the Pietistic movement, was born in Alsace in 1635. By his study of the Protestant mystic Arndt he was introduced to the ideas of the Catholic mystics of pre-Lutheran times, such as Tauler, Gerson, and à Kempis. At Geneva he came under the influence of the Jesuit apostate Labadie, who, doubtless, had not discarded all Catholic principles when he left the Church. Spener's biographer, Hossbach, paints in dark colors the religious and moral condition of German Protestantism in Spener's day. Spener himself complained that the pastors were worldly-minded men, whose whole idea of the pastoral office was summed up in the delivery of sermons that were but the faintest and thinnest copies of academical lectures on Lutheran orthodoxy; arrogant dogmatism and controversial bitterness were the only features that gave a semblance of life to those dreary, heartless, and utterly futile dissertations. Zeal and devotion were unknown to those German Pharisees. The natural result was widespread carelessness, impiety, and immorality among the people. Despairing of directly influencing the godless masses, Spener founded his *Collegia Pietatis,* whence his movement derived its name; he assembled a few chosen souls in private dwellings, "Ecclesiolae in Ecclesia" as he called them, for mutual edification by common prayer, spiritual conversation, and reading of the Bible. To explain and

to further his aims, he published in 1675 his *Pia Desideria,* in which he advocated spiritual and devotional training in theological seminaries, unction and piety in the pulpit, and godliness of life as the essence of true religion. In Strassburg, Frankfurt, Dresden, and Berlin he carried on his apostolate with great zeal and success. But the official defenders of Lutheran orthodoxy soon began to snuff the air for the odors of pestilential heresy. As a result Spener's friends and disciples lost their public positions in the universities and had to endure not a little persecution. Among those may be mentioned Francke, who founded the famous orphan asylum at Halle, where a new university founded by a prince with Pietistic sympathies, opened its doors to the new missionaries.

Pietism was subjective and sentimental; it emphasized practical godliness rather than doctrinal orthodoxy. When the guiding hand of Spener was withdrawn, this practical and devotional tendency became one-sided and issued in dogmatic indifferentism. A later development was the rationalistic criticism of the Bible initiated in Germany by Semler, who had been trained under Pietistic influences in Halle. Pietism also ruled for a time in Königsberg and thus we come to Kant, who was himself reared in a Pietistic atmosphere. About the year 1823, Halle University, the defender of Pietism, was united with Luther's old University of Wittenberg, whose professors had been the most eager defenders of Lutheran orthodoxy during Spener's lifetime. One of the most distinguished graduates of the united university was Ritschl, who may be regarded as one of the main sources of those Protestant "infiltrations" which produced the phenomenon called Modernism. Of kindlier interest is Albert Von Ruville, who learned the lesson which Spener missed, that the Catholic Church is the true home of love and freedom, where alone piety and truth can live in harmony and peace. He was professor of history in Halle-Wittenberg at the time of his conversion.

It may be the result of indifference about the questions in dispute, or it may be a matter of tactics, that Protestant writers from Hossbach downward endeavor to minimize the importance of the points at issue between Spener and the Wittenberg professors. It is usual to say it was all a dispute about words,

about the exact interpretation of theological formulas. Even Catholic writers have allowed themselves to be misled into repeating expressions like these. The question at issue, as the professors saw clearly, though Spener failed to see it, was this: Was Luther's new gospel the old true gospel of Christ? Did it justify him in breaking with the Church? Did he really rediscover Christianity, and re-announce it to a generation that had never heard of true religion?

Now take the central point of the whole discussion, a point which is of overwhelming interest to all men, and which especially concerns students of conversion, reformation of life, revival of religion. Is it possible for any man, justified or not, to obey the law of God, to avoid all mortal sin? Is a man able, is he free, even with the help of God Himself, to be pure in soul and blameless in conduct? Are the thoughts, words, deeds of the best of men, foul sins in the sight of God, overlooked merely by Divine Mercy, for the sake of Christ? The Wittenberg doctors made statements in answer to these questions which Hossbach characterizes as utterly monstrous and unthinkable in their absurdity, which simply denied the very possibility of a decent Christian life, acceptable in the sight of God. Spener himself hotly answered the doctors that it was an absolute shame for the Lutheran Church to have and to tolerate teachers who could make such statements, and that too in the very name of orthodoxy. Spener was right, so far; but he was egregiously wrong when he went on to claim that the Lutheran formularies of faith and Luther himself were with him in his abhorrence of such anti-Christian teaching. No doubt, here as elsewhere, Luther and his faithful disciples had contradicted themselves with entire recklessness; Luther on occasion had been able to give, from the reminiscences of his Catholic period, moving descriptions of the generous devotion and the heroic virtue of saintly men. But all this was an abandonment of his own new gospel, wherein total depravity even of the regenerate, and merely external imputed holiness, are the essential core. Spener was really attacking Protestantism at its very heart, and the Wittenberg professors were defending the whole cause of the Reformation. It was a fight in which the very life of Lutheranism and Protestantism was at stake. And the defenders

of Lutheran orthodoxy had no doubt whatever as to the utter impossibility of conversion and reformation of life in any real sense of the words. Now Professor James was no theologian; indeed he scorns the very name. But he ought to have familiarized himself with the facts before he committed himself to the deplorable statements of his Gifford Lectures.

In the Halle school of religion was trained Count Zinzendorf, the famous head of the Moravian community of Herrnhut in upper Lusatia. John Wesley was much impressed by what he saw of the Moravians during his voyage to Georgia with General Oglethorpe's expedition. He afterward came under the influence of Peter Bohlen, the Moravian leader in England, and in due time visited Herrnhut. Time and experience of the sour fanaticism of the Moravians considerably cooled the first fervor of his admiration, until at length he published a syllabus of their errors and heresies, for the warning of all true Christians. Wesley's criticisms were justified to a large extent; he was especially right when he denounced the lapse of the Moravians from the healthy Christian spirit of Spener's practical piety into the slough of Lutheran psychology and metaphysics. In the Moravians and afterward among his own followers he saw the excesses of Antinomian immorality into which the Lutheran doctrine must plunge every man who really accepts it as the truth. At the same time it is fair to add, with Mohler, that among the Moravians we meet with some beautiful examples of personal devotion to our Divine Lord in His Passion and Death. Catholics, at all events, will take no part in the irreligious mockery with which the "Cross and Blood Theology" of Zinzendorf was greeted by so many Protestants, both in his own time and afterward. That essentially Catholic devotion raised many a poor Moravian far above the miserable errors of his creed. On the other hand, in the absence of direction and guidance, drawn from centuries of experience of the human soul, based upon the perennial wisdom of the Church, those poor devotees gradually sank into unhealthy emotionalism, fanatical self-deception, narrowness of intellectual and religious sympathy, and utter vagueness of religious principle, which betray themselves in the wearisome iteration of the pitiful cant of the modern Pharisee. To those dregs are finally reduced every Protestant

movement in the direction of genuine piety, which allows itself to be deflected by the terror and the tyranny of the Protestant tradition and the Luther-legend away from the home of holiness and truth.

The character and the work of John Wesley are deserving of Catholic attention. According to Mohler, he was a very able man, steeped to the finger-tips in the classical culture of Oxford, but above all filled with a glowing zeal for the kingdom of God. Newman disliked his dominating spirit, his personal arrogance, and his self-sufficiency; but when he was lecturing on Anglican difficulties he challenged his Anglican hearers to show that they had been blessed with more striking signs of Divine favor than had been vouchsafed to the Methodists, and he avowed his conviction that, if he were asked to name the Protestant teacher who most closely resembled the great Catholic apostles, like St. Philip Neri or St. Francis Xavier, he would name John Wesley. In like manner Mohler compares him to St. Alphonsus Liguori, the apostle of the neglected Catholic poor in Italy, and he quotes with approval the words of Southey, who wrote in his *Life of Wesley,* that in other days Wesley might have been a reforming pope or the founder of a great religious order. Milner deals more gently with him than with any other Protestant leader. Lilly accepts Newman's estimate, and goes on to indicate the impulse toward religious earnestness and true piety, which, passing on from Wesley to the Evangelicals, became in Newman, Faber, and their friends, a force of equal magnitude with the dogmatic principle in creating the Oxford Movement. In one sense the Tractarians were anticipated by the Oxford Methodists of a hundred years before. Just as Newman and his friends were the butt of sneer and slander, Wesley and his companions were mocked as "The Holy Club", "The Bible Bigots", "The Bible Moths", and "The Enthusiasts". This last nickname had a peculiar sting in an age of extreme reaction from the excesses of Puritan fanaticism. In his sermon at the foundation of the City Road Chapel in London, Wesley gives an account of the origin of the name of Methodist itself.

Under the influence of à Kempis, William Law's *Serious Call,* and Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living,* Wesley and his companions adopted the Catholic principle of a rule of life; they

met regularly for spiritual reading and conversation; they had fixed hours for prayer; they fasted and gave alms according to definite rules. Wesley says: "The regularity of their behavior gave occasion to a young gentleman of the college to say, 'I think we have got a new set of *Methodists'*, alluding to a set of physicians, who began to flourish at Rome about the time of Nero, and continued for several ages. The name was new and quaint; it clave to them immediately, and from that time, both these four young gentlemen, and all that had any religious connexion with them, were distinguished by the name of Methodist."

Directly from à Kempis, indirectly from Taylor and Law, Wesley derived Catholic principles, which, like those of Spener, struck at the very heart of Protestantism. The watchdogs of the Established Church were not slow to scent the coming danger. In view of the present attitude of Methodists toward the Catholic Church it sounds ironical to state that Wesley was challenged from the beginning of his career to show that he was not a Papist, a Jesuit in disguise. Wesley in his sermon "On God's Vineyard" tells us that a learned man called Dr. Trapp had his own notion about the origin of Methodism. "When I saw," said the Doctor, "these two books [of William Law] *The Treatise on Christian Perfection* and *The Serious Call to a Holy Life,* I thought these books will certainly do mischief. And so it proved; for presently after up sprang the Methodists. So he [Mr. Law] was their parent." Wesley continues: "Although this was not entirely true, yet there was some truth in it. All the Methodists carefully read these books, and were greatly profited thereby." With the inevitable Protestant limitations, these books are on the lines of the standard works of Catholic asceticism, like the *Devout Life* of St. Francis de Sales, or *The Spiritual Combat* of Lorenzo Scupoli; indeed it might be worth while for some Catholic critic to investigate the question as to how much was borrowed by Law and Taylor from Catholic sources. But without explicit and avowed borrowing, the strong meat of Catholic piety, even in scanty morsels, did not suit the Protestant palate, and so Wesley was made to feel that he was an alien hostile spirit in his own Church. This charge of Popery rankled in Wesley's bosom all his life;

according to a law stated by Newman in a similar connexion, Wesley was therefore forced to come out strong against Rome from time to time. Every slight departure from the gospel according to Martin Luther in the direction of true piety, was regarded as a step toward Rome; the victim of the Protestant tradition was forced by the exigencies of his position to dip into the Lutheran vocabulary of abuse to vindicate his orthodoxy. His own troubled mind and his Protestant critics forced these tactics upon him. Yet Wesley had a sincere admiration for Fénelon, and boldly avowed his belief that many Catholics were real Christians; he desired that all of them would practise the lessons of à Kempis and imitate the life of the saintly Archbishop of Cambrai.

The Articles of the Church of England continued to hold Wesley entangled in some of the meshes of Lutheranism even after his eyes were opened to the real character of Luther's gospel; loyalty to his Church compelled him to repeat Lutheran formulas even while he was reading into them meanings utterly alien to the spirit of their authors. Here, too, we find a motive for his occasional outbursts of No-Popery zeal. But anti-Catholic bigotry is not the real lesson of Wesley's life, even though it seems to be the most cherished heritage of most of his modern disciples. The real lesson was learned by Newman and Faber, as Von Ruville also went on where Spener halted.

Historians like Green and Lecky are enthusiastic in their accounts of the reformation of life and manners effected in England by the Wesleyan movement. They paint in the blackest colors the irreligion and the immorality of all classes of the English people at the time when Wesley began his labors. A writer in the *North British Review,* 1847, says: "Never has a century risen on Christian England so void of soul and faith as that which opened with Queen Anne, and which reached its misty noon beneath the second George—a dewless night succeeded by a sunless dawn. There was no freshness in the past and no promise in the future. The Puritans were buried and the Methodists were not born. The philosopher of the age was Bolingbroke, the moralist was Addison, the minstrel was Pope, and the preacher was Atterbury. The world had the idle discontented look of the morning after

some mad holiday, and, like rocket-sticks and the singed paper from last night's squibs, the spent jokes of Charles and Rochester lay all about and people yawned to look at them. The reign of buffoonery was past, but the reign of faith and earnestness had not commenced."

The profanity and impiety and immorality of the English upper classes, the worldliness and worse of the Anglican clergy, the brutal ignorance, heathenism, and vice of the masses, were perhaps unparalleled in any country that called itself Christian, with the exception, perhaps, of Germany at the moment when Luther and Melanchthon saw and bewailed the fruits of their new gospel. The wonderful change for the better which historians acknowledge toward the close of the century is attributed by most impartial authorities to the work of the Wesleyans. But this subject does not concern us here. What does concern us is the teaching which Wesley used. Nor need we dwell upon the personal characteristics of the leader in this great movement. Suffice it to say that Macaulay ascribes to Wesley a genius for government not inferior to that of Richelieu, that Buckle characterizes him as the first of theological statesmen, that Leslie Stephen says of him that no such leader of men appeared during the eighteenth century.

In a famous passage in his *Journals* Wesley gives an account of his "conversion". It occurred on 24 May, 1737. He writes: "In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldergate Street, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me, that He had taken away *my* sins, even *mine,* and saved *me* from the law of sin and death."

A writer in the *North American Review,* June, 1903, remarks upon this pasage: "John Wesley had rediscovered the Lutheran, the Pauline, doctrine, of justification by faith. It is a profoundly interesting fact that the revelation came to him in the reading of Luther's Preface to St. Paul's great Epistle. The relation of these three great reformers is a true apostolical succession."

This writer is simply misled by phrases and words. There is another passage in Wesley's *Journal* which is quite as interesting and important as his account of his conversion. It occurs under date, Monday, 15 June, 1741. It is as follows: "I set out for London; and read over in the way, that celebrated book, Martin Luther's *Comment on the Epistle to the Galatians*. I was utterly ashamed. How have I esteemed this book, only because I have heard it so commended by others. Or, at best, because I had read some excellent sentences occasionally quoted from it! But what shall I say, now I judge for myself? now I see with my own eyes? Why, not only that the author makes nothing out, clears up not one considerable difficulty; that he is quite shallow in his remarks on many passages, and muddy and confused on almost all; but that he is deeply tinctured with mysticism throughout, and hence often dangerously wrong. To instance only in one or two points: How does he (almost in the words of Tauler) decry reason, right or wrong, as an irreconcilable enemy to the Gospel of Christ? Whereas, what is reason (the faculty so-called) but the power of apprehending, judging, and discoursing? Which power is no more to be condemned in the gross, than seeing, hearing, or feeling. Again, how blasphemously does he speak of good works and of the law of God; constantly coupling the law with sin, death, hell, or the Devil! and teaching, that Christ delivers us from them all alike. Whereas, it can no more be proved by Scripture, that "Christ delivers us from the law of God", than that He delivers us "from holiness or from heaven". Here (I apprehend) is the real spring of the grand error of the Moravians. They follow Luther for better or worse. Hence their "No works, no law; no commandments". But who art thou that "speakest evil of the law, and judgest the law"? "Tuesday 16. I came to London and preached on those words (Gal. 5:6) 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love'. After reading Luther's miserable comment upon the text, I thought it my bounden duty openly to warn the congregation against that dangerous treatise, and to retract any recommendation I might ignorantly have given it".

The importance of this passage can scarcely be exaggerated. The fundamental doctrine of Luther, which he read into the Epistle to the Galatians, is the doctrine of justification by faith alone. The "miserable comment" which Wesley rejected is as follows: "The faith that alone justifies is that which apprehends Christ . . . and not the faith which embraces in it charity." In his sermon on Charity, Wesley cries out: "Hear ye this, all ye that are called Methodists. You of all men living are most concerned herein. You constantly speak of salvation by faith and you are in the right for so doing. . . . But consider, meantime, that, let us have ever so much faith, and be our faith ever so strong, it will never save us from hell unless it now save us from all unholy tempers." In his fifth discourse on the Sermon on the Mount, he meets Luther face to face. He states one of Luther's favorite positions as follows: "What did our Lord do with the Law? He abolished it. There is but one duty, which is that of believing." "This," says Wesley, "is indeed carrying matters with a high hand; this is withstanding our Lord to the face, and telling Him that He did not understand how to deliver the message on which He was sent. The victims of this strong delusion imagine that they honor Christ by overthrowing His law. Yea, they honor Him as Judas did. It is no other than betraying Him with a kiss, to talk of His blood and take away His crown; to set light by any part of His law under pretence of advancing His Gospel. . . . It is impossible, indeed, to have too high an esteem for the faith of God's elect. . . . But at the same time we must take care to let all men know, we esteem no faith but that which worketh by love."

In his thirteenth discourse on the Sermon on the Mount he says: "That faith which hath not works, which doth not produce outward and inward holiness . . . which doth not stamp the whole image of God on the heart, and purify us as He is pure . . . is not the faith of the Gospel, not the Christian faith, not the faith which leads to glory. Oh! beware of this above all the snares of the devil, of resting on unholy, unsaving faith."

The Rev. A. Burbridge, S.J., sometime Wesleyan minister, in his tract on Wesleyanism in the History of Religion Series of the Catholic Truth Society of London, says: "This leaven

of frankly Papist doctrine steadily purged out the Antinomianism of Wesley's Societies, yet was not fully operative till put into the vigorous and concrete form of the minutes of the Conferences of 1770. Hither since the first Conference of 1744 had Wesleyan theology been painfully struggling. Here was driven home a truth that Wesley had striven in vain to couple with the Lutheran and Calvinist dogma of man's total depravity. Man, Wesley now frankly owns, is not purely passive in justification, but actively coöperates with grace throughout. Such a storm was raised among the orthodox as 'in its outrageous scurrility has never been surpassed'. Wesley bowed to it, and feigned a retraction, but the original minutes are adopted by his followers as sound doctrine and we quote them here. 'We have received it as sound doctrine that a man is to do nothing in order to justification'. Nothing can be more false. Whoever desires to find favor with God should 'cease from evil and learn to do well'. Whoever repents should do works meet for repentance. 'And if this is not in order to find favor, what does he do them for? Is not this salvation by works?' Not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition. What have we been disputing about these thirty years? I am afraid, about words. As to merit itself, of which we have been so dreadfully afraid, we are rewarded 'according to our works', yea, because of our works. How does this differ from *secundum merita operum,* 'as our works deserve'? Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot."

The same writer tells us that against the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination of certain men to evil, which makes God the direct author of sin, Wesley set his face like a flint. Augustine and Aquinas govern all his thought. Augustine's "noblest saying", "He who made us without ourselves will not save us without ourselves", and Aquinas's, "He watches over each as over all, and over all as over each", often quoted by Wesley, mark the poles of his dissent, in the affair of responsibility and providence, from the Reformers. The sermon he preached against Calvinism in 1740 on Free Grace is mainly a masterly vindication of the Tridentine Canons, as the sermon on Circumcision of the Heart is an expansion of the lessons of à Kempis. The "horrible decree" of Calvin-

ism contains "such blasphemies as might make the ear of a Christian to tingle". On this point Wesley broke with Whitefield and thus occasioned the first of the many schisms that have divided the Methodist body. Now let it be remembered that this very doctrine of predestination, in the most extreme and rigorous form, is, with the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the central teaching of Luther's comment on the Galatians. The blasphemies of Luther and Calvin were detected and rejected by John Wesley. Where is the "apostolical succession" here, where the harmonious development of spiritual religion?

If Wesley continued to use the phrase "imputed righteousness", it was to conciliate the Calvinists, or to avoid what the Protestant tradition calumniously described as the Catholic doctrine, despite the explicit teaching of Trent—the notion that man could merit justification. He was well aware of the disastrous consequences of the phrase, especially when understood as its author Luther understood it. "What we are afraid of is this," says Wesley in his sermon on The Lord our Righteousness, "lest any should use the phrase, 'the righteousness of Christ is imputed to me', as a cover for his own unrighteousness. We have known this done a thousand times." Here again the Antinomian poison which is inherent in Lutheranism becomes apparent. It was the great trial of Wesley's life.

On Sunday, 23 March, 1746, Wesley met at Birmingham one of the pillars of Antinomianism. He says in his *Journal* under that date: "I will set down the conversation, dreadful as it was, in the very manner in which it passed, that every serious person may see the true picture of Antinomianism full-grown; and may know what these men mean by their favorite phrase of being 'perfect in Christ, not in themselves'. Do you believe you have nothing to do with the law of God? 'I have not. I am not under the law; I live by faith'. Have you, as living by faith, a right to everything in the world? 'I have. All is mine since Christ is mine'. May you then take anything you will, anywhere (suppose out of a shop), without the consent or knowledge of the owner? 'I may if I want it; for it is mine; only I will not give offence.' Have you also a right to all the women in the world? 'Yes, if

they consent.' And is not that a sin? 'Yes, to him that thinks it is a sin; but not to those whose hearts are free.'"

Surely, says Wesley, these are the first-born children of Satan. Yet his own doctrine of "entire sanctification" produced this dreadful result too. It led persons of warm imagination to think that they had the "witness of the spirit" as to their absolute deliverance from every trace of human corruption; they imagined they were sanctified when they were not. In the year 1763 the London Society was made up largely of members who had "experienced" the truth of this extravagant doctrine; in that very year it was conspicuous for its reckless Antinomianism. Wesley's ablest disciple, Fletcher of Madeley, was constrained to write his *Checks to Antinomianism* against the danger. That work was warmly commended by Wesley himself in his funeral sermon "On the Death of Mr. Fletcher". Milner gives the following quotations from it in the sixth letter of his *Controversy*. "Antinomian principles and practices have spread like wild fire among our societies. Many persons, speaking in the most glorious manner of Christ and their interest in his complete salvation, have been found living in the greatest immoralities." "I have seen them who pass for believers, follow the strain of corrupt nature; and when they should have exclaimed against Antinomianism, I have heard them cry out against the legality of their corrupt hearts, which, they said, still suggested that they were to do something for their salvation." "How few of our celebrated pulpits, where more has not been said for sin than against it!"

According to the Antinomian, Sir Richard Hill, "even adultery and murder do not hurt the pleasant children but rather work for their good. . . . God sees no sin in believers, whatever sin they commit. My sins might displease God; my person is always acceptable to Him. Though I should outsin Manasses, I should not be less a pleasant child, because God always views me in Christ. Hence, in the midst of adulteries, murders, and incests, He can address me with, 'Thou art all fair, my love, my undefiled, there is no spot in thee.' . . . Though I blame those who say 'Let us sin that grace may abound,' yet adultery, incest, and murder, shall, upon the whole, make me holier on earth and merrier in heaven."

The genuine ring of Luther is in that; it is merely an expansion of the "Pecca fortiter" of the master. Milner tells us that the scandal and disgrace of these doctrines and practices alarmed Wesley. The Conference of 1770 contained the following avowals: "*Q.* 17. Have we not unawares leaned too much to Calvinism? *Ans.* We are afraid we have. Have we not also leaned too much to Antinomianism? We are afraid we have. What are the main pillars of it? That Christ abolished the moral law, that Christians are not obliged to observe it, that this is one branch of Christian liberty, etc."

The Huntingdon Connexion of Whitefield denounced these and other avowals of the Conference as "a dreadful heresy, which injured the very fundamentals of Christianity." Here is the quarrel of Spener and the Wittenberg doctors over again.

Now Wesley says that up to the time of his "Conversion" in 1737 he had been a Papist without knowing it. He had been without "justifying faith". With this "faith" he united the anti-Lutheran truths we have noticed. In his Sermon on "The Wedding Garment" preached at the age of eighty-seven, he recapitulates the Oxford Sermon on "Circumcision of the Heart" and proceeds to say: "Such has been my judgment for those three score years without any material alteration. Only about fifty years ago I had a clearer view than before of justification by faith; and in this, from that very hour I never varied, no, not a hair's breadth. . . . I am now on the borders of the grave, but by the grace of God I still witness the same confession. Indeed, some have supposed, that when I began to declare 'By grace ye are saved through faith', I retracted what I had before maintained: 'Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.' But it is an entire mistake."

The question for us to consider now is this, Was the faith Wesley speaks of really the Lutheran, or Evangelical *fiducia,* trust, "grasping" of Christ? Or does he merely retain the outward shell while he rejects the reality and the substance? Men have upheld contradictory propositions at the same time. Could this happen in the case of propositions that are the vital inspiration of a man's whole lifework? Did the spirit of à Kempis dwell in harmony with the spirit of Martin Luther

in Wesley's soul? It does not seem possible. We have seen Wesley's teaching about imputed justice, about real inward holiness, about the love of God, about merit and good works. His "entire sanctification", his "witness of the Spirit", giving direct infallible assurance from God that sin is forgiven and the soul regenerated, must remain stumbling-blocks in the way of anyone who tries to show that he was wholly untouched by the Lutheran taint of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Yet in spite of Lutheran phrases and the technical jargon of Protestant orthodoxy which got mixed up with his description of the faith that saves, it may be possible to show that here, too, Wesley was not very far from the Kingdom of God.

We have seen that Wesley demands real living faith that works by charity. It is quite startling to find him contrasting this with what he calls merely "*notional* faith". Here we are on Newman's ground. Moreover, Newman, in his lectures on Justification, tells us that Lutheran divines under stress of controversy use such expressions about justifying faith as make it seem to be or to imply all at once love, gratitude, devotion, belief, holiness, repentance, hope, dutifulness, and all other graces—all holy tempers, as Wesley would say. *Real assent* to the doctrine of the Redemption, emotional and imaginative realization of a "realizing knowledge and perception", to use the words of Jonathan Edwards, "of what our Divine Lord has done for me personally" is one of the principal means recommended by our own ascetical writers for obtaining the grace of perfect charity. A good meditation before the Crucifix is also an aid to perfect contrition. Is this what Wesley meant by justifying faith? Can we thus account for the apparently real conversions of Evangelical Revivals? Remember Mohler's testimony to the tender love and devotion to Christ on the Cross, shown by many a humble Moravian. It is worth while to try to vindicate the mercy of God to the deluded victims of Lutheranism. Wesley and others may use the technical expressions of Evangelicalism even when describing their own personal experiences in God's presence. But let us remember the tremendous force of early association, the all-conquering power of the Protestant tradition, working through life's most effective agencies and strongest influences, in the home, in the school, in the church, in law, in literature,

in society. Souls intensely Catholic may be speaking language intensely Lutheran; think of Newman before 1845. A real conversion cannot be Lutheran, no matter what language the convert uses to describe his experiences.

Professor James quotes from Jonathan Edwards's *Treatise on Religious Affections* a passage that is of the greatest interest and importance in this connexion. "A rule received and established by common consent has a very great, though to many persons an insensible, influence in forming their notions of the process of their own experience. I know very well how they proceed as to this matter, for I have had frequent opportunities of observing their conduct. Very often their experience at first appears like a confused chaos, but then those parts are selected which bear the nearest resemblance to such particular steps as are insisted on; and these are dwelt upon in their thoughts, and spoken of from time to time, till they grow more and more conspicuous in their view, and other parts which are neglected grow more and more obscure. Thus what they have experienced is insensibly strained, so as to bring it to an exact conformity to the scheme already established in their minds. And it becomes natural also for ministers, who have to deal with those who insist upon distinctness and clearness of method, to do so too."

Thus it may happen that a man who for the love of Christ and of God has repented of his sins and started a good life, expresses himself in the technical jargon of a system that denies human freedom, rejects love with scorn, and holds a virtuous life to be an impossible dream.

P. A. FORDE.

Dubuque, Iowa.

SHAKESPEARE AND CATHOLICISM.

"THESE are the times that try men's souls." Not that this is a great crisis of nationalism, or freedom, or society, or economics, or religion, or militarism, or commerce, or education, or literature. It is the Shakespearean Tercentenary. And, if a certain number of cities claim to be the birthplace of Homer, and a greater or less number declare with pride that, before they turned him out, Dante lived

among them, we shall now be confronted with men of letters who see in Shakespeare a realist, because they are realists; who see in him an idealist, because they are idealists; who see in him a lawyer, a nature-lover, an urban-enthusiast, a philosopher, or a deer-stealer, simply because they may happen to be lawyers, nature-lovers, urban-enthusiasts, philosophers, or deer-stealers. Even a Bacon because they are Baconians.

Then they will talk about religion. James J. Walsh, and William Burgess, and H. S. Bowden, and J. M. Raich, and Herbert Thurston will squabble over the possibility or probability of Shakespeare as a Catholic or a Protestant and over his religious beliefs, tendencies, and influence,[1] and little good will come of it. For, although we do know more, perhaps, about Shakespeare himself than about any other dramatist of his time, we still know so little and have to conjecture so much that the usual result will be merely, words, words, words. That he altered several of the old plays from which he drew source material for his own productions proves little or nothing beyond the greatness of his art. The omission of violent partisan statements from *King John* and *Romeo and Juliet* was not the act of a dissenter from the Established Church so much as it was the act of a man who knew that partisan statements appeal to a few, and non-partisan statements may find favor with all. Then when we find the machinery of a particular faith in a play whose scene is laid in a Catholic country or in Catholic times, our only assumption is that these things are in character. Others will point out the essential similarities between Shakespeare's statements and Catholicism, and the great differences between these same statements and "modern ethical teachers", "prevailing widespread pessimism", and "Puritan self-complacency", forgetting that Elizabethan England had very nearly the same religious faith, though not the same religious allegiance, as

[1] "Was Shakespeare a Catholic?" by James J. Walsh, *The Catholic Mind*, 22 April, 1915; *The Bible in Shakespeare*, by William Burgess, New York, 1903; "The Religion of Shakespeare," by H. S. Bowden, London, 1899; "The Religion of Shakespeare," by Edward R. Russell, *The Theological Review*, October, 1876; "Shakespeare's Stellung zur Katholischen Religion," by J. M. Raich, Mainz, 1884; and Herbert Thurston, S.J. (who seems to have kept his head better than most of the others), in the article on Shakespeare in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* and in *America*, 22 April, 1916.

the Catholic countries, and that early Anglican doctrine as Newman saw it in the Thirty-nine Articles was essentially Catholic doctrine.

On the whole, the soundest scholars are agreed that any Catholic hypothesis in this matter is founded on very scant ground, for which there seems to be ample contradictory evidence. It were vain to attempt to establish and carry out such an argument. If, finally, we are able to say that Shakespeare "in a special way belongs to us" and to write Q. E. D. at the end, it seems that Catholics would for some time after be engaged in blushing for many of his passages, and in explaining them away by many devious turns of scholastic logic. We cannot, you know, claim as Shakespeare's own thought those sentiments with which we agree and relegate as merely "in character" those which we find un-Catholic. Because Shakespeare was a dramatist, his characters speak, himself never.

The proper way to consider the whole body of Shakespeare's writing, if we must write of him from the Catholic viewpoint, is to consider his plays objectively. They are fiction on the stage or they are history on the stage. And we must simply look upon them as they have come down to us after three hundred-odd years as fiction and as history. In these two articles we shall then make some slight study of the works of William Shakespeare, and consider them as food for the modern reader who wants a criticism from one of his own faith on such passages as refer to matters of religion, taking first the historical plays, and later those plays which may be termed fiction.

I

The historical plays of Shakespeare, with the years to which they refer, are as follows:[2]

Name of Play	*Kingship*	*Date of Play*
King John	1199-1216	1593
Richard II	1377-1399	1595
I Henry IV	1399-	1597
II Henry IV	-1413	1598

[2] The dates are taken from the excellent introductions in *The Tudor Shakespeare* and from *The Facts about Shakespeare* (New York: The Macmillan Co.).

Henry V	1413-1422	1599
I Henry VI	1422-	1590-1
II Henry VI	—	1590-2
III Henry VI	-1461	1590-2
Richard III	1483-1485	1593
Henry VIII	1509-1547	1612

The first of these plays deals with a king and a reign when religion was a bitter contention of political import. King John was historically on both sides of the fence. He opposed Rome and he was befriended by Rome; and his reputation in all matters is far from spotless.

We must listen with caution to the ecclesiastical chroniclers in the case of a king who quarrelled with the Church. Yet they do not seem to have gone much beyond the mark in saying that John when he died made hell fouler by his coming. His throne of cruelty, lust, perfidy, and rapine was upheld by mercenary troops, the scourge of a nation.[3]

In spite of his many bad actions, the reign of John accomplished two good things for England: the loss of Normandy with its resulting increase of nationalism, and the grant of Magna Charta at the command of those northern lords and barons who were thoroughly English in all their origins and purposes. In spite of John's usurpation of the throne, his lack of principle, and his antagonism to certain chartered liberties, the play which served as the basis for Shakespeare's drama, "The Troublesome Raigne of John King of England", printed in 1591,[4] upholds his scandalous proceedings and it is not without profit to notice a few of the points in which Shakespeare's version differs from the older one. Says Thorndike:

Perhaps the most significant single change Shakespeare made was the excision of the anti-Romanist bias which in the older play had made John a Protestant hero.[5]

[3] *The United Kingdom.* A Political History. By Goldwin Smith. New York. 1899. Pp. 118-119. I have intentionally quoted here and elsewhere, from an historical writer who very evidently has a cumulative dislike for the Catholic Church.

[4] This is supposed to have been written during the year of the Armada, and often acted.

[5] *The Facts about Shakespeare,* p. 78.

Falconbridge ransacking the churches, the stabbing of an abbot, scenes from the old play, are omitted by Shakespeare. John was not a Protestant, of course; for, though he opposed the Pope on one occasion and so called down upon himself and his kingdom excommunication and the interdict, it must not be forgotten that John appealed to Rome to stop the later French invasion, that a papal legate sat by his side at Runnymede in opposition to those rebellious barons who named themselves the Army of God and Holy Church, nor that the Pope himself, now friendly to John, condemned the Charter as an ungrateful outrage. In admitting the spiritual and denying the temporal supremacy of the Holy See in English affairs, John was no more a Protestant than was Sir Thomas More, who died "in and for the faith of the holy Catholic Church",[6] maintaining the same distinction.

Having shorn "that usurping John"[7] of Protestant qualities, Shakespeare next proceeded to take from him the heroic. Constance of Bretagne was really remarried at the time of the action of the play, but Shakespeare lets her remain a persecuted widow with a persecuted son, and by thus gaining a brilliant dramatic conflict of characters as well as of forces, appeals to our sympathies for both Constance and Arthur and makes John appear more cruel and ruthless than the earlier play had done. John's actual ordering of the death of the rightful claimant, Arthur, and his hypocritical change of sentiment on the subject, are likewise new scenes introduced by Shakespeare. The source play would have us believe that the man was preferred to the boy; but Shakespeare emphasizes the fact that John acts in his "strong possession much more than his right".[8] Again Shakespeare condenses John's four wars into two so as to make it seem that one turned entirely about the question of Arthur's title, and the other Arthur's death, bringing the boy heir into an unwarranted prominence and confining the ecclesiastical controversies to unimportant positions.

Thus, by heightening the character of Arthur and suppressing virulent religious prejudice, Shakespeare has written a play

[6] Roger's *Life of More*, closing paragraph.
[7] Shakespeare, *King John*, Act III, Scene I, line 61.
[8] Ibid. Act I, Scene I, line 40.

which appeals to the human heart direct, of the Elizabethan age and of our own. The protests against papal political interference from "a royal criminal, weak in his criminality",[9] who wishes to "shake the bags of hoarding abbots",[10] are political protests and nothing more. The days of Innocent III are past; and the Pope no longer wants to rule Christendom in a temporal way by diplomatic bickerings with creature kings. Church and State are separate: and it is better for both the Church and the State. In this opinion, we are at one with the Elizabethan audiences who swore by the Thirty-nine Articles and by English independence. King John, then, is talking not so much against a religious faith as against a principle of interference, a principle which was during his reign becoming particularly obnoxious in a country newly becoming nationalized.

Enter PANDULPH.

King Philip. Here comes the holy legate of the Pope.

Pandulph. Hail, you anointed deputies of heaven!
To thee, King John, my holy errand is.
I, Pandulph, of fair Milan cardinal,
And from Pope Innocent the legate here,
Do in his name religiously demand
Why thou against the Church, our holy mother,
So wilfully dost spurn, and force perforce
Keep Stephen Langton, chosen Archbishop
Of Canterbury, from that holy see?
This, in our foresaid holy father's name,
Pope Innocent, I do demand of thee.

King John. What earthly name to interrogatories
Can task the free breath of a sacred king?
Thou canst not, Cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy, and ridiculous,
To charge me to an answer, as the Pope.
Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England
Add this much more,—that no Italian priest
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions:
But as we, under heaven, are supreme head,
So, under Him that great supremacy,

[9] Dowden.
[10] Shakespeare, *King John*, Act III, Scene III, lines 7-8.

Where we do reign, we will alone uphold,
Without the assistance of a mortal hand.
So tell the Pope, all reverence set apart
To him and his usurp'd authority.

King Philip. Brother of England, you blaspheme in this.

King John. Though you and all the kings of Christendom
Are led so grossly by this meddling priest,
Dreading the curse that money may buy out,
And by the merit of vile gold, dross, dust,
Purchase corrupted pardon of a man,
Who in that sale sells pardon from himself,
Though you and all the rest so grossly led,
This juggling witchcraft with revenue cherish,
Yet I alone, alone do me oppose
Against the Pope, and count his friends my foes.

Pandulph. Then, by the lawful power that I have,
Thou shalt stand curs'd and excommunicate:
And blessed shall he be that doth revolt
From his allegiance to an heretic;
And meritorious shall that hand be call'd,
Canonized and worshipp'd as a saint,
That takes away by any secret course
Thy hateful life.[11]

In looking at this passage and these speeches we must remember first that King John who calls the Pope "unworthy", is without a doubt the villain of Shakespeare's play.[12] Then we must remember that the "anointed deputies of heaven", the anointed kings by divine right, were in an actual physical sense anointed at coronation by a churchman—thus confusing Church and State. The Archbishopric of Canterbury, with all the lands and powers pertaining thereto which might fall to the Pope's creature Langton, was not in any large sense either, an ecclesiastical appointment. The priest was to John a meddling priest and the Pope's authority usurped authority only in relation to England and English affairs—it was again a question of politics and not of religion. Over the Channel

[11] *King John,* Act III, Scene I, lines 135-178.

[12] His compelled granting of Magna Charta is even neglected—one of the greatest and most beneficial gains of his or any other reign—as is also the Pope's forbidding of its observance.

"he that holds his kingdom holds the law",[13] and when John protests against the aggressions of Innocent III he is entirely within his legal right; and when all the wrath of the Church is called to curse and excommunicate with "bell, book and candle"[14] in a political cause, Pandulph is certainly acting outside his right.

Shakespeare was writing with his theme clearly in mind and could not paint John any whiter than he was when he opposed the Church, though he did paint him blacker than he was when he maltreated young Arthur. It was a political crisis and clearly so and Shakespeare is careful to emphasize this political character. He did not make John a hero, and he likewise came far from making him a doctrinal Protestant. He changed the old play to leave out the religious element and to show the struggle as it was. It was a political conflict in which religion unfortunately was slightly confused, if not through a plurality of causes, at least through a combination of elements.

The alteration of history, the insertion of speeches which were never spoken, the invention of incidents,[15] and real historical anachronisms, not merely detailed ones like the clock of ancient Rome[16] and the unfounded University of Wittenberg,[17] but actual changes in the unity and order of events[18]—these things in error are forgotten when Shakespeare is read as a whole and is found to have written with a noteworthy fidelity to the main temper of the circumstances, to have given us a true impression if not a true chronicle.

History like the drama is developed from the conflict of opposing forces. It is our loss therefore that Shakespeare skips over more than a hundred and sixty years after the death of John. He has given us no picture of the reign of Henry III (1216-1272) and his religious troubles, he who "would have been a good priest but was a bad king"; no picture of Edward I (1272-1307), one of the best of the Cath-

[13] So says Constance, Act III, Scene I, line 188.

[14] Act III, Scene III, line 12.

[15] Cf. *Richard II*, Act II, Scene III, lines 99-100.

[16] *Julius Caesar.*

[17] *Hamlet.*

[18] *King John* is one good example of this carelessness about dates; *Henry VIII* is another.

olic kings who clashed with the papacy, who really established Parliament and placed nationalism over feudalism; no picture of Edward II (1307-1327), "a hollow counterfeit of his father", whose fall inspired Marlowe and renders that dramatist's works more memorable; no picture of Edward III (1327-1377), during whose reign the Popes at Avignon were opposed for diplomatic rather than unfaithful reasons, and "Old John of Gaunt" had allied himself with Wiclif for ecclesiastical reform and pretended to an anti-clerical popularity. But if there does exist this great gap between Shakespeare and history through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the plays of *Richard II*, the two parts of *Henry IV*, *Henry V*, the three parts of *Henry VI*, and the story of *Richard III* make up for the earlier deficiencies.[19]

Here we find open before us "the purple testament of bleeding war". There was civil war and there was war with France. Shakespeare has told of the contenders struggling for the crown, of usurpers mounting the throne itself and there facing down upon the anointed king, of attempts to "wipe off the dust that hides our sceptre's gilt", of what the ancient chronicler Hall named "the unquiete tyme of Kyng Henry the Fourth", of the tragic enormity and fierce complexions in the age when Richard, Duke of Gloster, plotted and murdered for his unwarranted ends.

It seems as if Shakespeare almost aimed to avoid religious questions. He begins the play of *Richard II* in 1398, recounting only the fall of that monarch and telling nothing of Wat Tyler's rebellion, the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, Wiclif and the Lollards, nor of John Ball, "the clerical demagogue".[20] In the Epilogue to the second part of *Henry IV* he identifies his famous character, Sir John Falstaff, with Lord Cobham, saying "Oldcastle died a [Lollard] martyr and this is not he", to which Dowden commentates: "Shakespeare changed the name because he did not wish wantonly to offend the Protestant party nor gratify the Roman Catholics". He carefully

[19] Though there is an apparent break between the years 1461-1483, there really is none: Shakespeare tells the story of Edward IV and Edward V continuously, though chronologically compressed, in the plays which precede and follow.

[20] The quotation is from Goldwin Smith.

avoids the religious implications and possibilities in the character of Henry V, which many men have been fain to find there, and which many others have even read into Shakespeare.[21] Churchmen appear, to be sure, in connexion with Church affairs as when Cardinal Bouchier protests to Buckingham against a plan to "infringe the holy privilege of blessed sanctuary",[22] as when the Bishop of Ely is carefully avoided while Gloster plots for advancement,[23] when a clerical "tutor" and a priest "Sir John" appear for a moment and then leave,[24] and when the Bishop of Ely and the Archbishop of Canterbury worry among themselves about Church lands.[25] And Church paraphernalia and ritual come in from time to time, as the religious background of the age required. To be faithful in the picture one must put these things in; to leave them out would be holding an untrue mirror up to nature. Richard II gets Norfolk and Bolingbroke to take an oath on the hilt of a sword which forms a cross;[26] Henry V is insistent on the final rites of the Church for a departed soul;[27] Richard II tells the queen to cloister herself "in some religious house",[28] and later thinks of following the same course himself:

> I'll give my jewels for a set of beads,
> My gorgeous palace for a hermitage,
> My gay apparel for an alms-man's gown,
> My figur'd goblets for a dish of wood,
> My sceptre for a palmer's walking staff,
> My subjects for a pair of carved saints,
> And my large kingdom for a little grave.

There are proper and dignified references to rosary beads, in *Richard II*, and in the second part of *Henry VI*; Bardolph, very follower of Henry's very intimate Falstaff, was executed

[21] Cf. the *Shakespearean Commentaries* of Dr. G. G. Gervinus, translated by F. E. Bunnet, revised ed. (London, 1875), pp. 340 ff.

[22] *III Henry VI*, Act III, Scene I, lines 37-43.

[23] *III Henry VI*, Act III, Scene IV,

[24] *III Henry VI*, Act I, Scene III, and Act III, Scene II.

[25] *Henry V*, Act I, Scene I.

[26] The same appears in *Hamlet*, Act I, Scene V, line 160.

[27] *Henry V*, Act IV, Scene VIII, line 121.

[28] *Richard II*, Act V, Scene I, line 23.

for robbing a church.[29] Nor should we forget the tribute to banish'd Norfolk's fine crusading spirit, who

> fought
> For Jesu Christ in glorious Christian field,
> Streaming the ensign of the Christian cross
> Against black pagans, Turks, and Saracens:
> And toil'd with works of war, retir'd himself
> To Italy; and there, at Venice, gave
> His body to that pleasant country's earth,
> And his pure soul unto his captain Christ,
> Under whose colors he had fought so long.[30]

The last lines of *Richard II* express a wish in the heart of Henry IV to go likewise to the Holy Land as penance for his faults, and this idea appears and reappears at intervals as a serious but deferred intent in both parts of *Henry IV*.

But no amount of imagination can make possible an attempt to interpret these years, when there was really so much done in the way of religious invective and anti-clerical protest, as of prime ecclesiastical importance. That Shakespeare had imagination is not to be denied; but he wisely did not make such a foolish attempt. He emphasized in these hundred years the political struggle between rivals for the title of English King; and such churchmen as enter in, come only in the character of politicians.[31] That he failed to dwell on the very important steps toward the development of Parliament was possibly due to the fact that it would not please Tudor royalty and partly because it might even fail to interest a populace who lived under the Tudor "strong monarchy". But these churchmen who dabbled in politics did interest, because both the royal family and the groundlings knew the type well. The principal ecclesiastics turning their minds to such things were four.

The Bishop of Carlisle in *Richard II* is painted as "a clergyman of noble reverence", who urges Richard to war-

[29] *Henry V*, Act III, Scene VI.

[30] *Richard II*, Act IV, Scene I, lines 91-100.

[31] In three particulars Shakespeare has departed from history: (1) There is no warrant for the speech assigned to Chicheley in *Henry V*, urging the King to war; (2) no authority for having intriguing Richard III and Buckingham get theatrical support from two bishops and a prayer-book to impress the Mayor of London; (3) and he did not make the Bishop Arundel in *II Henry IV* protest against the execution of Scrope, as he legitimately might have done.

like ways and later defending him against calumniators predicts the dire internecine strife to follow.[32]

The Abbot of Westminster in the same play is "the grand conspirator" who plots for the reinstatement of Richard and has the rebellious heads actually meet at his house in Westminster.[33]

The Archbishop of York who appears in *I Henry IV* and is executed in *II Henry IV*, acts for mere revenge of his brother Scrope's death, excites and leads and plans and schemes and even portions off England for the rising Percies.

Scrope and his clerical confederates may have been exasperated by the heavy draughts the King had made on clerical revenues; they may have believed his government to be secretly inclined to the confiscation of church property; or the archibshop, a political and military prelate, may simply have shared the mutinous and intriguing spirit of the oligarchy.[34]

He, it was, probably who drew up the "things articulate", and turning insurrection to religion, had them

> Proclaim'd at market-crosses, read in churches,
> To face the garment of rebellion
> With some fine color that may please the eye.[35]

The subsequent troubles with the Pope resulting from Henry IV's summary dealing with an ecclesiastic are glossed over by Shakespeare:

Scrope was taken in armed, unprovoked, and criminal rebellion. Whatever might be his avowed aims, there could be no doubt that he and his party, if successful, would have dethroned the King. . . . The country was not to be devastated and dismembered with impunity by political intriguers styling themselves apostles of the religion of Christ.[36]

Shakespeare seems to have treated him in the history plays as he deserved, as a factious rebel and a politician rather than as a churchman.

[32] *Richard II*, Act III, Scene III, lines 178-185; and Act IV, Scene I, lines 113-149.

[33] *Richard II*, Act IV, Scene I, lines 326-333; Act V, Scene II; and Act V, Scene VI, line 19.

[34] Goldwin Smith: *The United Kingdom.* Vol. I, page 246.

[35] Cf. *I Henry IV*, Act V, Scene I; *II Henry IV*, Act I, Scene III; Act IV, Scenes I and II.

[36] Goldwin Smith: *The United Kingdom.*. Vol. I, pp. 247-8.

Cardinal Beaufort, because of the heated conversational clashes with Gloster, comes in for so much vituperation, though it was at the hands of one of Shakespeare's most renowned villains, that Goldwin Smith has called him "sublimely slandered".[37] He is deprecated as a "politician", as a "presumptuous priest", a "proud prelate", an "ambitious churchman", as "impious Beaufort, that false priest"; said to be "more haughty than the devil", a "haughty cardinal, more like a soldier than a man o' the Church", who never in the year goes to church except to pray against his enemies.[38] He is painted as a very active cardinal, though cursed at by Gloster and curtly told by the King to practise his own preachings; he hires spies, indulges in undignified squabbles, urges the King against Gloster, conspires his fall, and registers an objection to church extortions made by Suffolk. This last, the objection, is the only act which pertains to his position as a churchman, so completely has Shakespeare deleted the religious element from his historical play.

These men, the four of them, are politicians who also chance to wear the cloth. It is true, of course, that they imperil the dignity of their Church by engaging in the game of dynastic intrigue, and the question then arises if, at the fall of each, they conduct themselves as politicians or as churchmen. The Abbot of Westminster "yielded up his body to the grave . . . with clog of conscience and sour melancholy", and Beaufort died "blaspheming God and cursing men on earth"—these two at least were sketched by Shakespeare. And well might they have exclaimed with Wolsey,

> Had I but serv'd my God with half the zeal
> I serv'd my king, He would not in mine age
> Have left me naked to mine enemies.

Which leads us to a double point on which the conclusion of this essay will turn, the ambitious activities of these churchmen and the character of Wolsey in exciting years for the English Church.

The play of *Henry VIII,* as we have it now, is a poor dramatic representation of one of the most dramatic moments

[37] Goldwin Smith: *The United Kingdom..* Vol. I, p. 264.

[38] *I Henry VI,* Act I, Scene I, Scene III; Act III, Scene I; Act V, Scene II, Scene IV; *II Henry VI,* Act I, Scene I; Act II, Scene I.

of history. To Shakespearean enthusiasts it is some consolation that more than two-thirds of this piece was done by Fletcher and not by the Warwickshire Will.[39] Our poet did not, in this his last play, tell "very frankly of how England was torn from the Church by a brutal king to satisfy his lust".[40] There is a possibility that he projected a drama on the final separation as the one great historical event of the reign, and that a few scenes already written toward that end were focussed about the fall of Wolsey and scattered through the play by Fletcher, who acted either as collaborator or as adapter. At any rate, Shakespeare avoided the issue, a tremendous climax of interest for any poet. He makes no reference to the Act of Supremacy, or to the dissolution of the monasteries, and only a scant statement concerning Sir Thomas More. The actual facts of the dissolution would have made a powerful resolution of the dramatic theme.

Rapine was not statesmanship, nor did it walk in statesmanlike ways. The hour of the monasteries had come, but dissolution might have been gradual. It might have respected local circumstance and feeling. In the wild and ill-peopled north monasteries were still useful as hospices, as almshouses, as dispensaries, as record offices, as schools, perhaps in a rough way as centres of civilization. Their faith was still that of the people; their prayers and Masses for the dead were still prized. Their destruction and the religious innovations of the government brought on a dangerous insurrection in the north, called the Pilgrimage of Grace,[41] in the suppression of which the government showed its perfidy as well as its savage recklessness of blood.[42]

Undoubtedly the worst feature of the whole transaction was the distribution of the spoil.[43]

Some was spent in national defences, a small part in the foundation of new bishoprics. Far the greater part became the prey of the

[39] The introduction to the play in the Tudor Shakespeare indicates the exact scenes—showing that the most noted pieces of declamation are from the hand of Fletcher.

[40] As James J. Walsh says in the *Catholic World*, April 1916, p. 42.

[41] H. de B. Gibbins: *Industry in England*, pp. 203-4, assigns other causes for this, notably the extensive enclosures.

[42] Goldwin Smith: *The United Kingdom*. Vol. I, pp. 335-6.

[43] H. de B. Gibbins: *Industry in England*, p. 203.

King and his minions. The vast estates of noble houses remain monuments of the confiscation, and they bound those houses to the cause of Protestantism and a Protestant government so long as the conflict lasted. This is the origin, and hence were derived the politics, of the houses of Russell, Cavendish, Seymour, Grey, Dudley, Sidney, Cecil, Herbert, Fitzwilliam, Rich, which replaced the feudal baronage of the Middle Ages, linked to Protestantism and constitutionalism by their possession of Church lands.[44]

Thus fully has the characteristic temper of this great tendency been sketched simply to indicate what Shakespeare avoided in his play. The financial element was a strong motive in the mind of that Henry who had been so prodigal with his nation's money; it was undoubtedly an underlying cause and incentive. Mr. Goldwin Smith, a political historian, has said, "The sole cause of Henry's secession from the papacy and of religious revolution so far as he personally was concerned was his desire for a divorce".[45] And it is not exaggerating it to say that where Henry was concerned, personal causes were liable to be immediate causes. Thus this play which is called Shakespeare's, though it does not deal with the real essential centre of the reign of Henry VIII, does represent some of the important facts leading toward that centre.

The play is the play of Wolsey, the cunning, ambitious Cardinal of York, pitted against a simple woman far from her home and friends, and afterward pitted against the "strong monarch", Henry VIII himself. As Katharine is made to say, "all hoods make not monks"; and in the case of Wolsey, "cardinal sins and hollow hearts"[46] go about in churchmen's robes. Wolsey is a scheming politician, not a true representative of his Church:

> No man's pie is freed
> From his ambitious finger.[47]
>
> His thinkings are below the moon not worth
> His serious considering.[48]

[44] Goldwin Smith: *The United Kingdom.* Vol. I, p. 334. See also H. Belloc: *The Historic Thames* (Wayfarer's Library Edition), pp. 127-8, 140.

[45] Goldwin Smith: *The United Kingdom.*. Vol. I, p. 318.

[46] *Henry VIII,* Act III, Scene I, lines 23, 104.

[47] *Henry VIII,* Act I, Scene I, lines 52-53.

[48] *Henry VIII,* Act III, Scene II, lines 134-135.

He is desirous of sitting in the papal chair; he falsely denies true charges of heavy and extortionate taxations; he maintains a rich house in unnecessary luxury;[49] by his manipulations and attempted interference he brought Henry to condemn the "dilatory sloth and tricks of Rome".[50] To be sure, we find him condemning Sir Thomas Bullen as "a spleeny Lutheran", and Cranmer as "an heretic, an arch-one", and magnanimously praising his successor, Sir Thomas More, as "a learned man" who will "do justice for truth's sake and his conscience". When his overthrow is complete and he pauses to say "a long farewell" to all his greatness, he then turns to thoughts of God. Not as the Abbot of Westminster or Cardinal Beaufort did Wolsey die; but, in the calm and serenity of a great man, "he died fearing God". Yet there is little doubt that he ceased to worship Ambition and began to think of God only when he fell,

> like Lucifer,
> Never to hope again.

It is a late repentance.

> I have ventured,
> Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders,
> This many summers in a sea of glory
> But far beyond my depth. My high-blown pride
> At length broke under me, and now has left me,
> Weary and old with service, to the mercy
> Of a rude stream, that must forever hide me.
> Vain pomp and glory of this world, I hate ye!
> I feel my heart new open'd.

The fact that Fletcher wrote most of the phrases we have quoted here,[51] and not Shakespeare, is beside the point. "Love and meekness become a churchman better than ambition." This is a play of ambition and not of religion. Its central point is the fall of Wolsey and not the conflict of the Churches. Though it hinges about the divorce, the excommunication by the Pope—sweeping across Europe to strike at the crown of Henry—is not brought forward. There is no

[49] One of the points charged against him was that he changed the rushes on his floors every day—an extravagant waste.

[50] *Henry VIII*, Act II, Scene IV, line 237.

[51] Also the final passages about Elizabeth: "In her days God shall be truly known".

clear clash between a king and a foreign papacy, as in *King John*. The old tragic idea of the fall of princes here comes back again, the execution of Buckingham, the injustice done to Katharine, and the reduction of Wolsey. These fell indeed. And their fall was the same. Politics contrived with politics and religion was only accidental.

Thus we have a similarity in treatment in *King John* and in *Henry VIII*. Nor does the tendency end there. It extends as well to the plays which cover the years between. Shakespeare has followed the same method continuously, a method of detachment. He has detached himself from the theses of both parties. History and historical drama march on parallel paths to the same end. We are in the field of political endeavor where politicians happened also to be abbots, bishops, and cardinals. Shakespeare recorded the facts as historical facts, presenting them in the dramatic mood as well as in the dramatic manner. But if he did not alter the personalities of prelates who held state offices, he likewise did not take advantage of their religious connexions to assail them unduly. He was fair, remarkably so, and held no brief for either party. The Elizabethan age was a time of religious controversy and the temptation must have been great to take sides with one faction or another and so gain cheap and calculated applause.[52] We have seen how the particular dignitaries were handled. We have observed how the chief emphasis was a political emphasis. The art and mind of Shakespeare were bent toward ecclesiastical dissension. So, naturally, he proceeded—though not so dispassionately—at least almost as impartially as history. He discounted biased feeling in the clerical chronicles from which he drew and discounted the prejudices of the "good Queen Bess". It was a middle course. He steered it fairly and well.

We shall next turn from these historical plays to those which, dependent upon invention, may be classed as fiction.

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

New York City.

[52] Joan of Arc only is severely handled. He upholds her in the early scenes, but treats her harshly after her fall. *I Henry VI*, Act V, Scenes III and IV.

Analecta.

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV.

De Erectione Provinciae Reginensis, divisione Dioecesis Sancti Bonifacii et Erectione Archidioecesis Winnipegensis.

BENEDICTUS EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Inter praecipuas Apostolicae Sedis curas ea semper enituit novas dioeceses et ecclesiasticas provincias erigendi quoties vel territorii amplitudo vel fidelium numerus vel itinerum asperitas, vel alia huiusmodi, ad efficaciorem reddendam pastoralem sollicitudinem et vigilantiam id exigerent. Quod si utiliter hoc contigit aliis in regionibus id quoque in Canadensi Dominio expedire visum est, ut amplissimae civiles provinciae, quibus Dominium ipsum constat, et quae quasi status civiles habentur, ab invicem independentes et unico foederali vinculo coniunctae, hierarchia donentur propria, adeo ut unaquaeque civilis provincia, provinciam ecclesiasticam saltem unam, propriam et independentem constituat. Quibus omnibus mature consideratis, Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum, qui rebus consistorialibus praesunt, consilio, suppleto etiam quatenus opus sit quorum intersit, vel sua interesse praesumant consensu, Nos, Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, in provincia civili

memorati Dominii, Saskatchewan nuncupata, novam ecclesiasticam provinciam erigere statuimus et decrevimus, duas dioeceses Reginensem et Principis Alberti a provincia ecclesiastica Sancti Bonifacii sejungendo, et ecclesiam Reginensem in Metropolitanam constituendo, eique dioecesim Principis Alberti uti suffraganeam assignando. Hisce itaque Apostolicis litteris ecclesiam Reginensem ad Archiepiscopatus honorem et dignitatem evehimus, omnibus metropoliticis iuribus et praerogativis, quae ad Ecclesias Metropolitanas spectant ipsi concessis, eique subiicimus dioecesim Principis Alberti. Hisce pariter Apostolicis litteris Venerabilem Fratrem Oliverium Eleazarum Mathieu, hactenus episcopum Reginensem, in Archiepiscopum eiusdem dioecesis constituimus, quin aliis Apostolicis Litteris opus sit. Insuper peramplam dioecesim Sancti Bonifacii in duas partes dividimus, et partem orientalem cis flumen Rubeum, ubi est urbs Sancti Bonifacii, antiquae huic ecclesiae Archiepiscopali reservamus cum privilegiis et iuribus metropoliticis, quibus antea fruebatur, exceptis tamen duabus dioecesibus Reginensi et Principis Alberti, Partem vero occidentalem trans flumen Rubeum, ubi est urbs Winnipeg, novae dioecesi Nobis immediate subiectae et Archiepiscopali, quam hisce Apostolicis litteris erigimus et ab urbe principe Winnipegensem appellandam statuimus, Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine assignamus. Harum dioecesum divisoria linea erit commenticia illa, seu imaginaria linea, quae a finibus antiquae dioecesis Sancti Bonifacii descendit meridiem versus per medium lacum Winnipeg usque ad ostium fluminis Rubei: postea ad meridiem pariter prosequens, ascendit per medium cursum fluminis Rubei, et pergit ultra oppida Sancti Bonifacii et Winnipeg usque ad occursum parallelae lineae, quae separat regiones, vulgo *Townships,* IX et X a censu officiali Gubernii Canadensis determinatas: deinde haec ipsa linea parallela procedens erga occidentem divisoria erit utriusque dioecesis usque dum incidit, seu occurrit in meridianam lineam quae statuta est a memorato censu officiali inter sectiones, vulgo *ranges,* XII et XIII occidentales, hoc est ad occidentem lineae principalis positas: denique ex hoc puncto divisoria linea denuo ad meridiem perget usque ad fines civiles Dominii Canadensis et Statuum Foederatorum Americae, coincidens cum finibus quibus comitatus *Souris* separatur a comitatibus Macdonald et

Lisgar civilis provinciae Manitobensis. Volumus autem ut Archiepiscopi Winnipegenses omnibus iuribus, privilegiis et praerogativis quibus ceteri Archiepiscopi fruuntur et ipsi gaudeant, ideoque, praevia postulatione rite facienda in Consistorio, usum Pallii et Crucis ante se ferendae, inter fines tamen propriae Archidioecesis, ipsis concedimus. Ad dotem Winnipegensis Ecclesiae constituendam assignamus bona et reditus omnes, etiam adventitios quacumque ratione ad mensam archiepiscopalem obventura, data simul Archiepiscopo pro tempore, discreto eius arbitrio, facultate cathedraticum imponendi, inter varias ecclesias in urbe Winnipeg existentes aptiorem in Cathedralem seligendi atque alia ab bonum archidioecesis regimen necessaria vel utilia iuxta sacros canones statuendi ac decernendi. Item quod spectat ad archidioecesis Winnipegensis regimen, administrationem, dotationem ac taxationem ad ipsius Archiepiscopi potestatem, auctoritatem, attributiones, officia, iura et munia, ad Capituli Cathedralis, vel Consultorum Collegii erectionem, ad Seminarii dioecesani institutionem, ad ipsorum fidelium et clericorum onera, iura, aliaque id genus, servanda iubemus, quae sacri Canones, praecipue Tridentina Synodus statuunt ac praescribunt, sartis insuper tectisque Concilii plenarii Quebecensis primi editis decretis. Mandamus insuper ut documenta omnia, iura et acta, quae archidioecesim Winnipegensem eiusque fideles respiciunt a cancellaria Metropolitanae Ecclesiae Sancti Bonifacii, quum primum fieri poterit, tradantur cancellariae huius novae archidioecesis ut in eius archivio religiose asserventur.

Nobis insuper ac Sedi Apostolicae reservamus facultatem novam ineundi harum dioecesum dismembrationem seu circumscriptionem, quandocumque id expedire in Domino visum fuerit.

Hisce omnibus ut supra dispositis, ad eadem fideliter exsequenda deputamus Venerabilem Fratrem Peregrinum Franciscum Stagni, archiepiscopum Aquilanum et in Canadensi ditione Delegatum Apostolicum, eidem tribuentes necessarias et opportunas facultates, etiam subdelegandi ad effectum de quo agitur quemlibet ecclesiastica dignitate insignitum ac definitive pronunt'andi super quavis difficultate vel oppositione, in exsecutionis actu quomodolibet oritura, facto insuper ei onere ad Sacram Congregationem Consistorialem intra sex

menses transmittendi authenticum testimonium peractae exsecutionis, ut in eiusdem S. Congregationis archivio asservari possit.

Contrariis quibuslibet etiam peculiari et expressa mentione dignis minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo decimo quinto, die quarta mensis decembris, Pontificatus Nostri anno secundo.

Expedita die decimaquarta mensis martii, anno secundo.

Loco * Plumbi.

O. Card. Cagiano De Azevedo ✠ C. Card. De Lai,
S. R. E. Cancellarius. *S. C. Consistorialis Secretarius.*
Iulius Campori, *Protonotarius Apostolicus.*
Raphael Virili, *Protonotarius Apostolicus.*
Reg. in Canc. Ap., vol. XIII, n. 19.
M. Riggi, *a tabulario C. A.*

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII.

I.

Decretum circa Imagines exhibentes Beatissimam Virginem Mariam indutam vestibus sacerdotalibus.

Cum recentioribus praesertim temporibus pingi atque diffundi coepissent imagines exhibentes Beatissimam Virginem Mariam indutam vestibus sacerdotalibus, Emi ac Rmi DD. Cardinales Inquisitores Generales, re diligenter perpensa, fer. IV, die 15 ianuarii 1913, decreverunt: "imaginem B. M. Virginis vestibus sacerdotalibus indutae esse reprobandam".

Feria vero IV, die 29 martii 1916, huiusmodi Decretum publicandum mandarunt.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Officii, die 8 aprilis 1916.

Aloisius Castellano, *S. R. et U. I. Notarius.*

II.

Decretum: Declaratur Dubium circa Indulgentiam Christianae Salutationis: "Laudetur Iesus Christus".

Andreas archiepiscopus Leopoliensis Ruthenorum Supremae S. Congregationi S. Officii sequens proposuit dubium: "Christiana salutatio *Laudetur Iesus Christus* habet, praeter

indulgentias tempore vitae, etiam indulgentiam plenariam hora mortis, si is, qui consuevit salutationem hanc in vita usurpare, in hora mortis SS. Nomen Iesu saltem corde, si non potest ore, invocaverit. Quaeritur igitur, num ad istam indulgentiam in hora mortis lucrandam, etiam tamquam conditio pertineat, ut moribundus mortem tamquam peccati stipendium de manu Domini patienter sustineat?"

Emi DD. Cardinales Generales Inquisitores, feria IV, die 12 aprilis 1916, responderunt: "Observentur opera praescripta, prout descripta inveniuntur in *Raccolta di orazioni*, etc., a S. Congr. Indulgentiarum approbata die 23 iulii 1898, eodem anno edita, pag. 54, n. 36."

Et feria IV, die 13 aprilis 1916, Ssmus D. N. D. Benedictus div. prov. Pp. XV, in audientia R. P. D. Adsessori S. Officii impertita, supra relatam dubii solutionem Emorum Patrum ratam habuit et confirmavit.

L. * S.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius.*

D. PASQUALIGO, O.P., *Comm. Gen. S. O.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS.

I.

DECRETUM CIRCA QUASDAM CHOREAS IN STATIBUS FOEDERATIS AMERICAE SEPTENTRIONALIS ET IN REGIONE CANADENSI.

Elapso saeculo, in foederatis Americae septentrionalis Statibus usus incoeperat catholicas familias convocandi ad choreas quae per multas noctis horas cum conviviis aliisque solatiis protrahi consueverant. Cuius rei ea dabatur ratio et causa, quo scilicet catholici se mutuo cognoscerent et amoris caritatisque vinculis intimius unirentur, simulque ut subsidia pro hoc illove pio opere necessaria compararentur. Qui autem conventus indicere eisque praesidere solebant, praesides plerumque erant alicuius pii operis, et non raro ipsi ecclesiarum rectores vel parochi.

Verum Ordinarii locorum, quamvis de recto fine eorum qui has choreas promovebant non dubitarent, nihilominus damna et pericula inolitae praxis perspicientes, sui officii esse censuerunt eas proscribere: et ideo in can. 290 plenarii Concilii III Baltimorensis haec statuerunt: "Mandamus quoque ut

sacerdotes illum abusum, quo convivia parantur cum choreis (*balls*) ad opera pia promovenda, omnino tollendum curent".

Ast, ut in humanis saepe accidit, quae iustissime sapienterque ab initio iussa fuerant, paullatim in oblivionem venire coeperunt, et chorearum usus denuo invalescere, imo et in proximam Canadensis dominii regionem diffundi.

Quae cognoscentes Emi S. C. Consistorialis Patres, auditis pluribus locorum Ordinariis, et re multo cum studio examini subiecta, censuerunt, standum omnino esse sanctionibus a Concilio Baltimorensi III statutis: et, probante SSmo D. N. Benedicto PP. XV, decreverunt, sacerdotes quoslibet sive saeculares sive regulares aliosque clericos prorsus prohiberi, quominus memoratas choreas promoveant et foveant, etiamsi in piorum operum levamen et subsidium, vel ad alium quemlibet pium finem; et insuper clericos omnes vetari, quominus hisce choreis intersint, si forte a laicis viris promoveantur.

Hoc autem decretum publici iuris fieri et ab omnibus religiose servari Summus Pontifex iussit, contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 31 martii 1916.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, EP. SABINEN., *Secretarius.*

L. * S.

† THOMAS BOGGIANI, ARCHIEP. EDESSEN., *Adsessor.*

II.

DECLARATIO CIRCA CLERICALIS VESTIS USUM IN REGIONE CANADENSI.

A plenario Concilio Quebecensi duae clericales vestes recognitae sunt: altera talaris, quae proprior clericis est, et communi lege in sacris functionibus unice adhibenda iubetur, altera brevior, quae, si nigri coloris sit, ad genua usque protendatur et cum collari romano iuncta, a Patribus Quebecensibus pro civili usu admissa fuit, et qua clericis propria hisce in locis passim agnoscitur.

Additum quoque fuit circa usum harum vestium morem loci servandum esse.

Iamvero quum in praesenti dubia ac dissensiones quaedam orta sint circa hoc alterum praescriptum, nonnulla colligere oportet quae ad rectam legis intelligentiam et ad pacem servandam expediant.

Sacra Tridentina Synodus circa ecclesiasticas vestes, utique pro civili usu, haec sanxit: "Etsi habitus non facit monachum, oportet tamen clericos vestes proprio congruentes Ordini semper deferre, ut per decentiam habitus extrinseci, morum honestatem intrinsecam ostendant; tanta autem hodie aliquorum inolevit temeritas religionisque contemptus, ut propriam dignitatem et honorem clericalem parvi pendentes, vestes etiam publice deferant laicales, pedes in diversis ponentes, unum in divinis, alterum in carnalibus; propterea omnes ecclesiasticae personae, quantumcumque exemptae, quae aut in sacris fuerint, aut dignitates, personatus, officia aut beneficia qualiacumque ecclesiastica obtinuerint, si postea quam ab episcopo suo, etiam per edictum publicum, moniti fuerint, honestum habitum clericalem, illorum Ordini ac dignitati congruentem, et iuxta ipsius episcopi ordinationem et mandatum non detulerint, per suspensionem ab Ordinibus, ac officio et beneficio, ac fructibus, reditibus et proventibus ipsorum beneficiorum; nec non, si semel correpti, denuo in hoc deliquerint, etiam per privationem officiorum et beneficiorum huiusmodi coërceri possint, et debeant, Constitutionem Clementis V, in Concilio Viennensi editam, quae incipit *Quoniam,* innovando et ampliando." [1]

Proprium itaque et nativum Ordinarii ius est intra limites a sacra Tridentina Synodo statutos, constabilire modum et formam clericalis vestitus pro sua cuiusque dioecesi. Quo iure usi sapienter sunt Patres Quebecenses, dum duas in toto Canadensi dominio vestes probaverunt et statuerunt.

Aliud vero Concilii praescriptum circa alterutrius vestis usum, hoc est, morem servandum esse qui actu in loco viget, ceu facile quisque intelligit, non est nec esse potest absolutum et perpetuum, sed natura sua conditionatum et transitorium. Mores scilicet, temporum decursu novisque supervenientibus adiunctis, mutationibus obnoxii evadere possunt. Quo eveniente, expedit ut etiam vestis, quaecumque demum sit, novis aptetur moribus et conformetur, dummodo semper ecclesiastica.

Supponi autem nequit Concilium voluisse hac in re, per se minoris momenti et fluxa, nativum Ordinariorum ius auferre vel circumscribere: id namque neque prudens, neque sapiens fuisset.

[1] Conc. Trid., Sess. XIV, c. 6, *de Ref.*

Quibus consideratis, Sacra haec Congregatio, cohaerenter ad litteras die 5 maii 1914 iam datas, censuit:

1. Usum in dioecesi vigentem circa clericales vestes mutari sine causa non debere: iustam tamen libertatem singulis Ordinariis esse usum illum mutandi, requisito capituli vel consultorum dioecesanorum voto, si nova tempora et adiuncta hoc suadeant, Deo et Apostolicae Sedi dumtaxat rationem reddituris.

2. Clericum a propria dioecesi in aliam migrantem posse ibi vestem dioecesis suae retinere, quamvis diversam ab ea quae in loco est praescripta, dummodo sit una ex duabus a Patribus Quebecensibus probata: idque usquedum domicilium vel quasi domicilium ibidem non ineat.

3. Sicut in ieiunii et abstinentiae lege aliisque similibus fas est peregrinis loci usum sequi, ita pariter salvam esse cuilibet clerico potestatem se conformandi usibus loci ad quem transmigrat, quin ab Ordinario suo hac una de causa reprehendi vel puniri valeat.

Ssmus autem D. N. Benedictus PP. XV resolutionem Em. Patrum ratam habuit et probavit, eamque publici iuris fieri iussit, ut ab omnibus ad quos spectat rite servetur, contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 31 martii 1916.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, EP. SABINEN., *Secretarius.*

ROMAN CURIA.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

5 April: His Eminence Cardinal Domenico Serafini named Protector of the American College (United States) and of the Scotch College (15 April), Rome.

7 April: His Eminence Cardinal Filippo Giustini named Protector of the Irish College, Rome.

The following were named Domestic Prelates of His Holiness the Pope:

12 April: Monsignor William J. Walsh, of the Diocese of Waterford and Lismore.

13 April: Monsignor Cornelius Flavin, of the same Diocese.

15 April: Monsignor Michael Weldon, of the Diocese of Peoria, Illinois.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

POPE BENEDICT XV establishes a new ecclesiastical province in Saskatchewan, Canada, comprising the Archdiocese of Regina and the Diocese of Prince Albert. These sees are taken from the province of Saint Boniface. Moreover, the see of Winnipeg is raised to archiepiscopal rank.

S. CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE: 1. Reproves the making of pictures showing the Blessed Virgin in sacerdotal vestments; 2. answers a question regarding the indulgence attached to the salutation "Laudetur Jesus Christus".

S. CONGREGATION OF CONSISTORY: 1. Publishes a decree forbidding all priests, both secular and regular, and all other clerics to promote or encourage balls for church purposes of any kind in the United States and Canada; besides, if laymen arrange for these balls, clerics are not allowed to be present at them: 2. prescribes the clerical costume that is to be worn in Canada, both at sacred functions and for other occasions.

ROMAN CURIA gives official list of pontifical appointments.

BLESSING THE SCAPULAR MEDAL.

Qu. A reply in the REVIEW to the following queries would be much appreciated.

The Holy Office by decree of 16 December, 1910,[1] granted the power "datis dandis" for blessing a determined medal, which could replace for all ecclesiastical purposes the scapular, v. g. of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel; the same Holy Office, by decree issued on the same date, apparently also fixed the time limit for the automatic expiration of this faculty.

1. Does a priest who received this faculty, say 1 January, 1911, still possess in virtue of this decree the power of blessing the scapular medal, say after 1 January, 1916? And if so, why? since the decree says: "Sacerdotes omnes . . . ne amplius numismata sic benedicendi utantur facultate, quinquennio ab illa obtenta transacto".

[1] Cf. *Acta Apost. Sedis*, Vol. III, pp. 23-24.

2. Does a priest who received this faculty, say 10 July, 1914, retain this power in virtue of the decree for five full years from date of reception? i. e. until 10 July, 1919. This would seem a legitimate conclusion, " quinquennio ab illa obtenta transacto ".

3. Is the power granted in virtue of this decree still in force after the lapse of five years from date of issuance, i. e. after 16 December, 1916? In other words, did the faculty naturally expire 16 December, 1916, so that both those who did not receive it prior to this date, and those whose five years had then expired, would not have it now?

Resp. In the decree quoted by our correspondent it is declared that a priest who has the faculty of enrolling in a certain scapular has the faculty to bless the corresponding medal. Such a case offers no difficulty. In the decree, however, the additional provision is made that priests, secular and regular, may be empowered, for five years, to bless indiscriminately all scapular medals, the faculty to lapse at the end of the five years. After that time a priest may bless only the medals corresponding to the scapulars in which he is empowered to enroll. The questions raised by our correspondent bear on this point: Is the term of five years to be reckoned from the issuance of the faculties or from the date of the decree (16 December, 1910). We have no hesitation in answering that the former is the plain intent and meaning of the decree. The text seems to us to be clear: " Sacerdotes omnes, saeculares vel regulares, etiam conspicua fulgentes dignitate, ne amplius numismata sic benedicendi utantur facultate, quinquennio ab illa obtenta transacto ". The first query should, therefore, be answered in the negative, the second in the affirmative; and in the third case we should say that, if the faculty was granted, say, two years ago, it is still in force, and will be for three more years.

RINGING THE BELL AT BENEDICTION.

Qu. During the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on the occasion of the Forty Hours' Adoration is it proper to ring the bell or gong as the case may be?

Resp. Decrees of the S. Congregation of Rites prescribe that during the Benediction of the people with the ostensorium the choir should not sing, although the organ may be played

"suavi et gravi tono", as Wapelhorst expresses it. The ringing of a bell or gong is a custom which is merely tolerated and is by no means universal.

ABLUTION OF FINGERS AT LAVABO, WHEN THERE IS NO SERVER.

Qu. Would you kindly answer, in the REVIEW, what is the proper thing to do in the following case? Some time ago a priest said Mass for the Sisters in a certain convent. At the Lavabo he found no altar-boy, as is quite usual, but the cruet of water and a basin placed on the altar. He washed his fingers by pouring the water alternately on one hand with the other. He noticed a few drops fell on the spotless linen outside the edge of the basin. After Mass he called the sacristan and said: "Sister, why do you not do as is done in many convents of Sisters, where they have no boy to serve Mass—place some water in a small glass dish, like a finger bowl, so that the priest may wash his fingers without having to pour water from the cruet on his fingers and thus spatter the altar cloth?"

The Sister took the suggestion and placed the proposed finger bowl with water for the regular chaplain. When he saw it, he asked the Sister what it was for, and on being told, said: "That is not in accordance with Rubrics", and refused to use the finger bowl. The Rubric supposes a server who is to pour the water on the fingers of the priest at the Lavabo; but when necessity dispenses with the server, may it not permit a convenience in the washing, such as is suggested by the priest, and as is done in many convents. A priest not used to saying Mass without a server, finds it a rather clumsy thing to pour water on both hands and in so doing often sprinkles the linen. Is there no decision on this matter? Can the method above suggested be said to be forbidden by the Rubric?

Resp. We do not know of any such Rubric as that to which the chaplain referred. The Rubrics of the Mass simply say "lavat manus" at the Lavabo, and "abluit digitos" at the Communion. In treatises like that of Zuladi's *The Sacred Ceremonies of the Mass,* the question is not referred to at all. Indeed, we know of localities where, even when there is a server, use is made of a glass bowl at the Lavabo.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS IN BLESSING BEADS, ETC.

Qu. In the last issue of the REVIEW I see a question regarding blessing beads and attaching indulgences to them with a single sign

of the Cross. Our faculties read: "Benedicendi Coronas, etc. eisque applicandi indulgentias juxta folium typis impressum". Besides these faculties I have secured the special ones for applying the Dominican, the Crozier, and the Brigittine indulgences. Every Sunday, and sometimes during the week, people come to me to have beads blessed. If I were to read the proper formula, for instance, for the Dominican indulgence, I could hardly get through my other work. Besides, I have a mission, where I stay only a certain length of time on Saturdays and Sundays. I ask you, then, can I attach all these different indulgences by a single sign of the Cross for each indulgence?

Resp. If a priest has the faculty to bless crucifixes, rosaries, etc., by the simple sign of the Cross, he may by so doing attach to the pious objects all the indulgences assigned to them. This holds for all cases in which the blessing is to be given "in forma consueta Ecclesiae". When, however, a special formula is expressly prescribed, that formula must be used unless, (1) when obtaining the faculty, the priest also obtains the power to use the sign of the Cross in place of the prescribed formula, or (2) when, after having obtained the faculty in question, by another rescript he obtains the power to use the sign of the Cross. Such rescripts, we know, are granted in reference to the Brigittine indulgence. It is well, however, to bear in mind the admonition of Moccheggiani: "Advertendum est praefatum signum crucis debere esse revera tale, *non motum quemcumque manus,* ut interdum videre accidit, ne, ita faciendo, periculo nullitatis exponatur ipsa benedictio, cum amissione indulgentiarum".

IRREMOVABLE RECTORS.

Supplementing the query answered in our May number (page 590): "Has Rome done away with irremovable rectors?" we publish the following communication from a metropolitan chancery:

"It is true that 'Rome has not done away with irremovable rectors'; but, it is true also that, owing to special conditions, submitted to and approved by the Holy See, Rome has dispensed several bishops (among them the Archbishop of Santa Fe, New Mexico) from the obligation of appointing henceforward any irremovable rectors in their dioceses on the death or resignation of the present incumbents."

We are always glad to have our attention called to exemptions and indults. It is only by communications of this kind that their existence can be made known to our readers.

CATHOLIC LAWYERS AND DIVORCE CASES.

Qu. Some time ago, a good conscientious Catholic lawyer spoke to me as follows: "I know that we Catholic lawyers cannot take up the case of Catholics who are seeking a divorce with the intention of contracting a new union, but how about the case of Protestants in the same circumstances?" He added that, although some Catholic lawyers in his county were constantly taking such cases without being excluded from the Sacraments, he, on the contrary, had always refused cases of the kind, with the result that he lost many clients. What do you say about the matter? A solution would be appreciated by many of your readers.

Resp. The principles laid down by theologians in this matter are definite enough. (1) A Catholic lawyer may take a divorce case, even though the parties are Catholic, when it is a question of a legal separation, with its civil effects. (2) When it is an action for divorce, he may defend the validity of the marriage against the plaintiff. (3) When the Church has declared the marriage invalid, he may attack the validity of the marriage in the civil court. (4) Some hold that, even when the marriage is valid in the eyes of the Church, a Catholic lawyer may attack its validity in court, not with the intention of enabling his client to contract another marriage, but in order to obtain the civil effects of a divorce decree. Even though he is convinced that his client intends to marry again, he may, say the theologians, take the case but dissociate himself from the evil intention, if there is a grave reason for his taking the case, such as a serious loss to himself.[1] Protestants are, according to a well-known principle, bound by ecclesiastical law in matrimonial matters. The "impedimentum ligaminis" would invalidate a subsequent marriage in their case as well as in the case of Catholics. Still the cooperation of the lawyer in their future sin is justified (according to the fourth principle cited above) by the fact that, if he

[1] Noldin, *De Sacramentis*, p. 780.

declines to accept divorce cases, he will probably not be given any business at all, which would be a "notabile damnum", as understood by theologians.

RENEWAL OF MATRIMONIAL CONSENT.

Qu. A Catholic and a Protestant went through the marriage ceremony in a Protestant church after the promulgation of the decree *Ne temere*. The marriage is, of course, invalid. At the suggestion of a priest they come to the Catholic Church to have the marriage rectified. The Catholic goes to confession and the parties are then joined in marriage by the usual Catholic ceremony. They are not told, however, that their former marriage was invalid, or that they must here and now renew their consent. They are both uneducated and it cannot be presumed that they themselves see the necessity of a new consent. Is it sufficient for validity that they go through the ceremony, or should they be told definitely to renew their consent? The reason for their coming to the church is known only to the priest. They come simply because they are told to come.

Resp. The circumstances as detailed by our correspondent would seem to indicate that the ceremony in the Catholic Church was invalid "propter defectum consensus". It may be that there was true matrimonial consent when the parties were united before the Protestant minister, and that that consent perseveres. It is required, however, that the consent be true, free, mutual, and *expressed by a sensible sign*. If the parties were so far from understanding the ceremony and the need of it that they went to the church merely because "they were told to come", even though they repeated the words of the ritual which express consent, the words, we are forced to conclude, had no meaning for them, and therefore had no power to constitute a contract. There are two courses open to the officiating clergyman. The first he might, we think, have adopted before going through the ceremony. He should have ascertained whether there was a chance to induce the parties to renew their consent explicitly. The other alternative is the revalidation of the marriage by a "sanatio in radice". In this alternative, however, it should be carefully ascertained whether the Protestant party is baptized or unbaptized. The original ceremony was, as our correspondent says, invalid, beyond all doubt. It makes a difference in peti-

tioning for a "sanatio", whether it was invalid by reason of clandestinity only or also by reason of the diriment impediment "disparitatis cultus". It should also be ascertained whether the consent in the Protestant ceremony was true matrimonial consent. If it was not, a "'sanatio" cannot be granted.

IS THE BISHOP OBLIGED TO CELEBRATE IN THE CATHEDRAL?

Qu. In a cathedral church where there are usually three priests stationed, three Masses are celebrated on Sunday. Recently, however, one of the priests was removed, and his place has not been supplied. Is the bishop, whose residence adjoins the church, and who is accustomed to say Mass in his private chapel, bound to say Mass in the church on Sundays, so that one of the priests will not be obliged to binate? A holds that he is, citing authorities, and arguing *a fortiori* from the fact that the bishop is pastor of the cathedral. B maintains that he is not, because none of the legislation on the point mentions the bishop.

Resp. There are reasons and authorities on both sides. It is true that none of the legislation in the matter mentions the obligation of the bishop. There are, however, theological discussions as to whether, in case a prelate who has the privilege of a portable altar is in the neighborhood, and he refuses to celebrate in the church, the priest who has the faculty to binate may legitimately use it. This phase of the question was discussed in the REVIEW for December, 1915 (pp. 695, 696). The question whether the bishop is obliged to say Mass in the cathedral is really a theoretical question. Unless he has a good and sufficient reason for celebrating in his private chapel, he would not refuse to celebrate in the cathedral, and as he is ordinarily the one to decide whether the circumstances justify granting the privilege of binating, if, by deciding to celebrate in his private chapel, he makes it necessary for one of the priests to binate, the question of the priest's obligation is thereby decided.

DISPENSATION FROM RECITATION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE.

Qu. In June, 1914, my former Professor of Philosophy (in Europe) visited me. It surprised me that the priest, whom I knew to be a very conscientious man, did not say his Breviary; hence I asked him why.

The priest told me that he had only asked his bishop for a celebret and the permission to go to America during his vacation, to visit some of his former students. His bishop not only gave him the celebret and the permission, but granted him also the privilege besides (he had not asked for it), of saying during his absence from home two rosaries of 5 decades a day, instead of his Breviary! Consequently he had left his Breviary at home.

A priest who has spent a few weeks in Europe, knows how much the Breviary may be in his way occasionally. First on the steamer, then during the couple of weeks at home, when every minute is almost taken up by former friends, who come and go.

Now the question I wish to ask is the following:

Under the faculties granted to the priests of our diocese I read the following: "Recitandi Rosarium B. V. M. si divinum officium ob aliquod legitimum impedimentum recitare non vales. In casu infirmitatis aut assidui laboris intelligitur Rosarium quinque decadum."

I think this paragraph is not very plain; or rather, the way it is stated I fail to see the privilege. Amongst priests I often hear disputes about this subject. This is why I should like to hear the right explanation. All priests are concerned, hence I feel sure that the matter is very interesting to the readers of the REVIEW.

Personally I am of the opinion, that if I cannot say my Office and have a *legitimate impediment* (e. g. I leave St. Louis for New York and happen to find that I locked my Breviary in my trunk instead of putting it in my satchel, or I forgot to bring it, or I lost it), then I hold that I am not bound to anything. It is impossible under the circumstances to say the Office, hence "ad impossibile nemo tenetur." (One surely does not need the privilege to say a Rosary under such circumstances).

In casu infirmitatis. If I am sick in bed and the doctor orders perfect rest, there is a moral impossibility, hence no obligation.

Assidui laboris. It is hard, I think, to fix a limit. I hold that when a person has to hear confessions on a Saturday, for seven or eight hours, the obligation to say the Office ceases. (Hence also here I fail to see where the privilege would come in being permitted to say the Rosary.)

I wish you to understand that I am of the opinion, that every priest must say the Breviary and ought to say the Rosary every day. I do

not believe that I have ever missed a word since I was ordained. But as a matter of argument I wished to ask when the real privilege can be used without scruples. The bishop who granted the privilege to the above-mentioned priest is known as a man of great piety. The granting of the privilege on his part cannot be called a mere declaration, but a real dispensation. No doubt the bishop had the *faculty* to give this dispensation.

Now what about *our faculty*? Is it not the same as the European bishop used? If so, could a priest of our diocese conclude: If a bishop in Europe considers a trip to America "ratio sufficiens" for granting the privilege, then this holds just as well a "ratio sufficiens" for a priest going from America to Europe for a vacation and such a one can make use of this faculty?

I hope you will answer this question in the next number of the REVIEW. Clearness on this point will surely be very welcome to many.

Resp. It would help to clear matters up if our correspondent would recall that there are "causae ex se excusantes", which are reduced by theologians to two heads, namely, "infirmitas" and "occupatio". Under the former, they include all kinds of physical inability, and also such cases as the impossibility of finding a breviary. Under the second head they include attending a sick-call such as comes unexpectedly on a cleric who has not yet recited his Office for the day and detains him until it is nearly midnight. In these cases, if the cleric can recite one of the smaller hours, or a notable part of it, "by heart", he is bound to do so, but he is not bound to recite other prayers by way of substitution. In the second place we should recall that, when there is doubt as to the sufficiency of the excusing cause, or when the excuse is bodily infirmity which is due to last a considerable time, recourse may he had to ecclesiastical authority which may, in granting a dispensation, impose other prayers, such as the recitation of the rosary, and in that case the cleric who uses the dispensation is obliged to recite the prayers substituted for the Divine Office. Thirdly, when the inconvenience would not be a "causa ex se excusans", as when a priest is obliged to spend five hours in the confessional, then, by virtue of a special faculty granted to missionary priests, including priests in the United States, he is allowed to substitute for the recitation of the Divine Office fifteen decades of the Rosary. Moreover,

the bishop may, if he sees fit, dispense from this substitution in whole or in part.

With regard to the particular case mentioned by our correspondent, we are not in a position to judge whether the bishop acted within his rights. We can only say that there is no likelihood of his example being followed by other bishops. On the one hand, the inconveniences of reciting one's breviary during vacation in Europe are grotesquely exaggerated. On the other hand, there is, so far as our observation goes, no inclination on the part of the clergy to seek relaxation of the law in this matter. Indeed, many hard-worked priests who on Saturday and Sunday might, strictly speaking, avail themselves of the dispensation granted to missionary priests, do not think of doing so, and, in spite of the manifoldness and difficulty of their duties, could truthfully say (if it did not sound boastful) that "they have never missed a word".

TWO CEREMONIES: IS THE MARRIAGE VALID?

Qu. John, a Catholic, becomes engaged to Bertha, an unbaptized Protestant. Shortly afterward he asks a friend if a Catholic may have two marriage ceremonies performed, one by the Protestant pastor of the bride, the other by the Catholic pastor of the bridegroom. This friend reports the conversation to the priest. When John and Bertha come to the priest for information, he explains the promises to be signed and emphasizes the following: "I promise that, in the solemnization of my marriage, there shall be only the Catholic ceremony". Bertha willingly signs the promises, a dispensation is obtained from the impediment *disparitatis cultus,* and the ceremony is performed by the priest. The next day the priest learns that the ceremony at the Catholic rectory was immediately preceded by a ceremony at the bride's home in the presence of the Protestant pastor. Is the validity of the dispensation affected by Bertha's insincerity in signing the promises? Is the validity of the dispensation affected by John's excommunication?

Resp. The promises made in the case of mixed marriages are requisites "ad liceitatem dispensationis" when the dispensation is granted by the Pope. They are requisites "ad validitatem" in other cases, because they are a *conditio sine qua non* of the valid exercise of the dispensing power dele-

gated to bishops. However, the promises required have regard to (1) the free exercise of religion by the Catholic party; (2) the Catholic education of the offspring, and (3) the possible conversion of the non-Catholic party. The promise in regard to the non-Catholic ceremony, while it may, in the circumstances, have been rightly insisted on by the pastor, is not a condition required either "ad liceitatem" or "ad validitatem dispensationis". It is, indeed, requisite that the prescribed promises be sincerely made, and, if it could be shown by overt act or utterance that Bertha did not intend to keep the promises, in regard to her husband's practice of his religion, etc., the dispensation and consequently the marriage would be invalid. The fact, however, that, contrary to express promise, she induced the bridegroom to go through the Protestant ceremony, does not of itself constitute proof of bad faith in regard to the other promises. Neither does the excommunication of John invalidate the dispensation or the marriage. It would, in case John were "excommunicatus nominatim".

ADMISSION OF CHILDREN TO FIRST HOLY COMMUNION.

Qu. When children prepare for First Holy Communion the pastor requests his assistants to give each child a so-called "Communion Ticket", if the child knows how to make a confession, and on the strength of it the pastor admits the child to First Communion, provided of course that the children also know what Holy Communion is. What about the *sigillum,* and would you approve the practice? The pastor's claim is that it frequently happens that children are admitted to Holy Communion who do not even know how to go to confession and that such children are a burden to the priest in confession. He says that the decree on First Communion implies that children know how to make a confession before being admitted to Holy Communion and that the practice which he advocates would be one way of obtaining the knowledge.

Resp. There is certainly no question of the *sigillum* here, as the "ticket" merely testifies that the child knows how to make a confession. If the tickets were issued by number and not by name, the *sigillum* would be perfectly safeguarded. It is equally certain that children should know how to go to con-

fession before they are admitted to First Holy Communion. It is not so certain that the practice advocated by the pastor is entirely commendable. There may be, and, in a parish in which the clergy take an immediate interest in the religious instruction of the children, there invariably are some other means of ascertaining whether the children who are candidates for First Communion are sufficiently instructed in the manner of making a confession.

DANCING PARTIES UNDER "CATHOLIC" AUSPICES.

The current "Analecta" contains a document of special importance from the S. Congregation of Consistory. Its purpose is to enforce the decree of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore which prohibits "entertainments" with balls for the purpose of promoting pious projects—"convivia cum choreis". The "provida mens" of the Bishops in Council assembled not only forbade such entertainments but enjoined the pastors to do what they could to prevent them. "Mandamus quoque ut sacerdotes illum abusum, quo convivia parantur cum choreis (*balls*) ad opera pia promovenda, omnino tollendum curent" (Conc. Plen. Balt. III. cap. V, n. 290).

How far ecclesiastical superiors may be responsible for the neglect of the decree is not easy to determine; but the fact that Catholic papers in various parts openly advertise such entertainments would indicate that no particular censorship has been exercised in the matter. A primary qualification of fitness of a Catholic editor is or should be the ability to exercise intelligent responsibility in safeguarding, besides knowing, the diocesan laws. Catholic editors may have been guided in such matters by priests who overlooked these laws. Some of them have been foreigners, and diocesan statutes, much less the Baltimore Councils, were not their normal guides. So the matter went on until we had a "custom" against which an individual voice and even the local Ordinaries found it difficult to raise a successful protest. Now the protest has come, apparently from Canada, whose border parishes have been invaded by the usage tolerated in the United States. It will be difficult to abandon it, at least without creating the discontent that turns hundreds who are bound by the chains of social

obligations away from the sacraments or the Church and religion. But the Holy See has made it clear that our tolerance has been amiss.

Once more we may be allowed to call attention to the conduct of the Catholic press. There has been a good deal of discussion recently about the duties of Catholic editors and about the support our people owe to Catholic periodicals. Some years ago the REVIEW published a paper on this subject. We reprint it in part here because it may be suggestive. The excuse of editors that "the priests should advise us in such matters" is puerile. A journalist has no right to assume the editorship of a Catholic paper unless he knows and is prepared to defend the laws of the Church, if need be even independently or against the practice of the priests. Says the writer referred to in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

When a brother custodian of "Religion's sacred fires" guards his trust according to his own conscience, even though his methods differ from mine, I may have no right to find fault. But if the smoke of those "fires" blows in my direction, to the detriment of my discipline and the confusion of my flock, surely my giving some account of the faith that is in me, cannot be construed into any assumption on my part of superior wisdom or piety, or as meddlesome impertinence.

Now I wonder how Catholic papers can consistently and conscientiously make a practice of publishing emblazoned accounts of dances and balls given by Catholic societies and under Catholic auspices. Catholic papers, persistently and rightly, I think, insist on the importance of the apostolate of the Catholic press. While the readers of Catholic papers may not accept as doctrine every salutary statement they see in a Catholic paper, most of them will, probably, accept as "gospel truth" from which there is no appeal, any declaration or suggestion favoring greater amplitude in a matter of coveted liberties.

Some time ago one of my Reverend neighbors was reported as having declared that his parishioners might dance all they wished. Knowing by experience that this man weighs the moral bearing of his words, I felt entirely safe in absolutely denying the report as it stood, and I soon found that he had said nothing of the kind. Such a declaration from a pastor would, it seems to me, unnecessarily encourage a practice which, given the reins, soon runs to the devil, and would considerably embarrass parents who conscientiously keep their sons and daughters away from such places of amusement.

But if such a declaration from a pastor were imprudent, is not the publication of such amusements in a Catholic paper likewise imprudent? Let a pastor see fit publicly to denounce dancing in his parish, while his hearers read reports in Catholic papers, of balls and dances under Catholic auspices, and they will probably conclude that their pastor is rather old-fashioned or fanatical, too young or too old to know better.

Of course, there is no dearth of authority, sacred and profane, ancient as well as modern, in support of the pastor's position. Several Councils of the Church have anathematized dances, and the Council of Laodicea forbade them even at weddings. The Council of Trent (sess. XXII. c. 1. De ref.) forbids clerics under pain of ecclesiastical censure to be even present at any. The good and learned St. Charles Borromeo called dances "a circle of which the devil is the centre and his slaves the circumference". St. John Chrysostom denounced them as "a school for impure passions". Many more similar texts might be adduced. Nor are these at variance with Holy Scripture, which says anent this subject, among other uncomplimentary things: "Use not much the company of her that is a dancer, lest thou perish (Ecclus. 9:4).

Should it be suspected that the saints are not competent judges in a matter of this kind, profane and heathen authors may be found galore to testify to the same effect. Sallust, for instance, himself a dancer, and anything but a saint, declared of a certain Roman lady, that "she danced too well for an honest woman". Even applied in our day these words are not without some truth, at least.

Certainly, there is no disputing the theory that dancing under favorable circumstances may be tolerated, and that even waltzing may be done decently. Yet may we not say, in the words of Dr. Cook, author of *Satan in Society*, that waltzes at their best are, to put it mildly, "subversive of that modest reserve and shyness, which in all ages has proved the true aegis of virtue"? Whence one might ask, has Terpsichore the right, under the palliating title of "fashionable grip", to sanction liberties and poses that would be accounted rude indecencies, to say the least, under any other auspices?

Of course so long as theory says that some dances may be innocent, on goes the dance—the St. Vitus's dance, the Tam O'Shanter dance, and the innocent dance. But it is one thing, quietly and restrictedly to tolerate dancing, and quite another thing to herald and trumpet such toleration to a public only too apt and eager to accept the liberty and ignore the restriction. (C. P. B.)

Such toleration, however, cannot be identified with the sanction given to public and fashionable dancing in connexion with Catholic charities or educational enterprises, in which

while we offer to Catholics aid and instruction with one hand, we press them down with the other hand to the low level in which they breathe sensual amusement. The advertisement of such amusements is not mere toleration.

CLERICAL DRESS.

The Sacred Congregation of Consistory, addressing the Canadian Clergy, vindicates the right of the Ordinary to enforce the provincial enactments regarding the wearing of the clerical habit. The decision provides that the custom of a locality (diocese) in the matter of clerical dress is to be maintained. But the Ordinary, with the consent of his Chapter or the Diocesan Board of Consultors, may alter the custom in conformity with the requirements of times and conditions. Clerics out of their own diocese may conform to the locality in which they dwell. But the dress is to be always ecclesiastical. What is considered ecclesiastical is laid down by the Council of Quebec.

The decree serves as a reminder that for the clergy of the United States a distinctive dress has also been prescribed by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. A deviation from the law, sanctioning ordinary civilian's dress in black, has become the almost universal custom and has at least the silent toleration of the Bishops. What is to be deprecated, however, is the practice, occasionally adopted by clerics traveling outside their own dioceses, of discarding all ecclesiastical indications in dress. Where that is a matter of convenience or necessity it is excusable. When it is intended as a disguise, it is abominable and as a rule a failure as well as a scandal.

TRANSLATION OF "MATER AMABILIS".

Mater amabilis means "Lovable Mother", or, if we prefer the superlative, "Most lovable Mother", or, "Mother most lovable".

The Latin word has not yet been transferred into English. We have "amability", but not the adjective "amable".

From the word *amicabilis* we have two English words, "amicable" and "amiable"; but "amiable", which is so often used in our litanies, does not represent *amabilis*.

J. F. S.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE LIFE OF MONSIGNOR ROBERT HUGH BENSON. By C. C. Martindale, S.J. In two volumes (Vol. I, pp. 401 ; Vol. II, pp. 479). Longmans, Green and Co., London and New York. 1916.

It is fortunate for all concerned that the story of Monsignor Benson's life was entrusted for the telling to so competent a narrator as the author of these volumes; to a mind so inclusive, so comprehensive; to a power of sympathy so intimate, so vital; to a literary sense so realistic yet withal so elevating; nor least, to hands so swift to complete their task so worthily. All these qualities of a genuine biographer are reflected from every chapter, if not from every page, of the two splendid volumes before us. First, the story is comprehensive. It sums up the life of Hugh Benson from cradle to grave, and it leaves nothing out: nothing that can throw additional light on his character or works: nothing, therefore, worth the telling. Everybody knows what Lockhart is said to have answered in reply to the query, why he had taken three volumes to narrate the life of Sir Walter Scott. "Because," he answered, "I didn't have time to do it in one." It was not, though it well might have been, a like reason that urged Father Martindale to devote two portly tomes to the life of so comparatively young a man and so relatively uneventful a career as that of Robert Hugh Benson. Though the work has been completed in the brief course of less than one year—in so short a time indeed that people who have been marveling at Benson's fecundity and celerity of production, may now extend their wonderment to the similar qualities of his biographer—nevertheless, the reason for the two portly tomes was not, at least wholly, that assigned in the parallel case by Lockhart; but that the author deemed it "a duty to set forth as carefully as might be the available evidence, omitting little enough, lest even one fleeting, yet significant expression of a personality might be lost, and regretting even what in deference to the sensitiveness of living persons he has deliberately excised. Had the witness been more homogeneous, the work might have been far shorter." Few if any readers will think that the work would have been "pleasanter if shorter". Sketches of Benson's life are not lacking. The present is no sketch, no outline; it is a filled-out story, a finished picture.

The materials for the elaboration of the biography were, of course, for the most part ready to hand. Living men and women who knew Benson personally and intimately—his incomparable mother, his

brothers, friends, penitents; a large epistolary correspondence; books that were practically the subject's autobiography (*The Confessions of a Convert*, and *The Papers of a Pariah*), together with Benson's numerous writings, religious, historical, fictional—all these were at the biographer's control. The sifting of them was the *opus et labor*, a task as difficult and laborious as it was exacting and delicate. But the difficulty lay not quite so much in the analysis and synthesis of the evidence as in the nature of the subject itself, the personality that was Benson. Every human being is a bundle of paradoxes, a system of contrarieties if not of contradictions; and the richer and the more complex the person, the more will he seem paradoxical; appear thus to himself, though he see himself ever as a harmonious unity in the midst of incessant varieties and discords; but far more so to his fellows who behold him in his shifting moods rather than in his abiding self. And so we must expect to meet with opposite estimates of Benson's character and work. People who see one side of his intensely vivid and intricately complex nature will, of course, pass upon him a judgment entirely opposite to the judgment of those who look at him from another angle or in another light. To give, therefore, "an epigrammatic verdict" on Hugh Benson is, as Father Martindale says, impossible. He warns us that even the desire "to do so must be quenched for any one who may read the conflicting conclusions arrived at, and so emphatically declared, by those who believe they knew him well, and are indeed worthy of all most scrupulous attention. 'He was a Saint of God,' one letter after another will declare: then, 'be *sure* to say,' one who has especial claim to hearing writes to me, 'that he was, anyhow, no sort or kind of *Saint*.' 'He was a Saint,' a third has said; 'but a peculiar one; a Saint of *Nature*.' He was self-forgetful: he never was unselfconscious. He was a genius, and could create; he was a dilettante—could assimilate, or rearrange, or convey with unique charm, ideas not his own. 'He was above all things humble,' one after another writes. And another and another that he was thoroughly self-willed; that he cultivated the virtues that he *liked*, 'having his sense of righteousness thoroughly in hand'; he was most lovable when least disciplined; 'he had the sort of subtlety,' a lady who knew him as few have known him says, 'which a child has in carrying out his own will whatever the rest of us thought or did. Whether we approved or disapproved, he went on playing his own games.' 'We most loved him for his personal charm'; yet, 'what men most saw and liked in him was his most intimate temptation.' He was a hard logician: he was a dreamer; impish; off at a hundred tangents. He was beyond all else sincere; he was always dressing up. 'Write a whole chapter on his *kindness*:' 'the moment he was

uninterested, he let you slide.' He was so gentle: he was so rough. 'He was the ideal Catholic priest.' 'He was simply Robert Hugh Benson.'"

Now it should be noted that these opposing judgments are passed by no superficial observers or chance acquaintances, but by those who seemed to know him long and intimately. That the verdicts are as vigorous as they are various is, as Father Martindale again observes, "not to be wondered at," for "Hugh was a vivid person, tingling with vitality, and the view which was taken of him, favorable or the reverse, could not possibly be vague. This was due partly to a general temperamental quality, partly to the tendency in Hugh to feel that the mood of the moment was exhaustive and destined to be permanent. He was rarely, then, hesitating or *tinted*; his colors were bold and his words incisive, and he created clear-cut impressions. In reality, he passed from one mood to another with the greatest rapidity and completeness, and had an astonishing power of forgetting what he had felt like in the mood of a moment ago, what he had wanted or decided, or even that the mood with its concomitants and consequences had existed. He revealed, too, one side of himself to the exclusion of the other, in response not only to his own mood, but to what the mood of his companion might call for. Whatever his own attitude of will and judgment, he constantly 'played up', with genuinely keen interest and unflinching courtesy, to the requirements of his consultant."

That beneath all these moods, all these shifting selves, there was a single self, and that not only in the deeper metaphysical sense of the term personality—a unified principle of action—but in the everyday, popular meaning of a conscious agent striving for an ideal, seeking to reach the aims of life, to unfold, perfect, and express himself, goes of course without saying. And herein lies the merit and value of the present biography, that it brings out into relief the principle of unity in Benson's character, life, and productions. It interprets Benson; it does not simply describe him, photograph him, paint him. It traces the influences of his home environments, the moulding power of a high-minded, religious, though somewhat rigid, father, and of a gentle-souled, sympathetic, cultivated, mother; of finely cultured brothers and sister; the contributing agencies of school and college; the peculiarly formative power of religious community life in the Anglican monastery at Mirfield; the influence of clerical training in Rome after Benson's conversion; the three years of parochial activity at Cambridge; his subsequent missionary labors —lecturing, preaching, instructing converts, guiding souls; and lastly and throughout it all from his boyhood onward, but most especially in the last dozen years of his Catholic life, his astonishing literary

productivity, a fertility, by the way, so prolific that Benson's publishers are said to have demurred to anything beyond two novels per annum, though rumor had it that he was held by contract to three. At all events there are almost a score of novels to his credit, together with about as many more works dealing for the most part with religious subjects, an aggregate which, when we remember that it was produced almost entirely during a period wherein his energies were being drawn upon by manifold priestly activities, may well challenge our admiration, while it points to the deep unity of Benson's life, the singleness of his principles and controlling power of his life's ideal.

It might be interesting as well to dwell upon some of the forces which entered into the development and shaping of Father Benson's life and character. Especially worth while might be some reference to the influence of his relatively short course of preparation in Rome for the priesthood: for here is found another instance of the paradoxes of his nature. And, indeed, it is only a mind so inclusive and so discriminating as Father Martindale's that is able to reconcile some of Benson's Roman experiences and utterances with the traditional training for the Catholic priesthood. Those who do not see Benson whole, who are unable to adjust some of his descriptions of life in Rome, with his larger mind and character, may find it not easy to harmonize them with the ideal preparation for the sacred ministry.

However, we must waive any insistence on these details in favor of the main principle which gives unity to Benson's life, which interprets him to us and which, running through his shifting "moods", makes of them but so many manifestations of a consistent self. That principle is, as Father Martindale points out, the Catholic doctrine of the Supernatural. It is obviously possible, perhaps not unusual, to regard Benson as a writer, an extraordinarily eloquent and forceful speaker, a charming personality, and so on. But all this is but "a thin and flimsy phantom of him—'the weak and beggarly A B C' —as St. Paul might name it,'" which would spell not even the scattered syllables of this great Word "which expressed either himself or his 'animating vision'." By the Supernatural, however, is here meant not a mere super-addition to his nature: not even a merely extrinsic code or dogma, nor yet even his life of piety as such. By the Supernatural is meant the raising of the whole man, "by God's grace, to a higher state of being, directed toward an incomparable fruition of Himself, in which nothing is lost, nothing merely replaced, but everything transfigured, perfected, and harmonized. 'His Roman Catholicism,' a very careful critic has written to me, 'sat but lightly, in reality, upon him: to the end he was *Hugh*. Certainly, he was Hugh. But not for that was his Catholic super-

nature a light and husk-like garment. No mere garment was it, but an inner principle issuing into bones and blood and skin. Grace destroys nothing but that sin which is alone destructive. It works from within outward. In Hugh, it preserved an innocence already in many ways safeguarded; it shielded it from temptations, and guarded it in temptations, subtle as are not those of most men. It carried him along an ascending path, step by step, fitted for his feet; it lifted him without crippling violence from the lower to the higher in that sphere which the Creator of his nature had Himself prepared: it alchemised that nature—so as by fire, it well may be, but no deadly flame—into that supernatural being of whose existence we learn by faith, though 'what we shall be, has not yet appeared.' In other ways his life may indeed be construed, yet not more easily; above all, not more comprehensively. Hugh 'lived *his* life' precisely because he lived by that which in it was divine."

And thus the story of Benson's life comes to its closing. All the details, countless in number as they are varied in shape and color, lead up to this unity of principle. They are all but so many illustrations of it, so many reflections of its simple radiance. In itself it may appear commonplace, but so do all great truths. Most principles are in their bald statement platitudinous. To be effective or impressive they must be viewed in their setting and application. So it is here. It is not that the biographer set out to prove a thesis or plead a brief. The facts gravitated naturally and of themselves to this centre. The author has done his part by directing his readers' attention to the inherent significance of the evidence accumulated.

But if the supernatural is essential to a right interpretation of Benson the convert, the priest, the missionary, the orator, the writer, it must not be forgotten that the natural goes far to explain Benson the *man*. Grace in him found an unspoiled personality; one that naturally lent itself to the supernal powers. While from his parents he inherited a nervous system sensitive and delicately responsive, nevertheless there was in him even as a child a certain mysterious toughness of fibre,

which caused it to resist relentlessly all that attacked its personality; and enabled it to throw off by instantaneous instinct what made for disintegration and so destruction of the self. But this power to reject alien environments was enormously assisted by the homes in which he lived; not all, there, was congenial; but enough was amply so, for the protection and nourishing of his soul. Negatively, this Puritan atmosphere protected his imagination; the romantic and inexhaustible resources of Lis Escop, Lambeth, and Addington gave it all the color, the variety, and the pleasurably strange which might be needed to prevent its losing itself, in practice, along summoning paths of the bizarre, the horrible, the splendidly corrupt, or other lines of psychic rebellion or despair. The alternate stimulus and check of so remarkable a father and an incomparable mother made the boy grow up neither depressed nor disso-

lute; daring yet not extravagant. His life already had in it something of a ritual, in which a certain rigidity of outline remains sacrosanct, with much liberty of interior ornamentation, and adaptation; and it was something too of a sacrament, where the material, however trivial seeming, is never otherwise than charged with the dynamic, and the spirit.

As a result of this integrity of nature there was patent in the man a remarkable simplicity, directness, fearlessness, "a power of clinging to God with his strength and his weakness". Many people, as Father Martindale remarks,

are conscious of themselves and their instincts mainly as barriers to their salvation, and to be "mortified", as they say. Their outlook is chiefly negative; they "must not" do this or that. They regard the world as *hiding* God; the senses as "ordered toward" what is *not* God, because material. Benson, I know, was happily handicapped in that his true instincts were so sound; whatever tricks his nerves might play him, he in his soul had nothing of mean dishonesties or lusts. Therefore, being sure that his will was set, in all things, Godward, there was nothing in him or outside of him that he could not take and use; regarding the world as holding God, his powers and instincts as issuing into sacraments of God, his life could be made almost wholly positive; he could exult, with the St. Francis he so loved, in his brother the sun and his sisters moon and grass and water, nor fear idolatry.

Thus far we have called attention to only one of the characteristics of the present biography, its comprehensiveness. Upon the other qualities mentioned at the head of this paper there remains no further space to dwell, much though we should like to speak of the happy manner in which the artistic qualities of some of Benson's principal works of fiction are treated. It will probably be by these compositions that Father Benson will be longest remembered. Many, most of them, are remarkable productions, wherein we see at work a wonderful imagination equally at home in man's interior life and in the world of nature. Benson's power of imagery was truly creative, and yet it never loses its poise or fidelity. For these things, however, and many others that cannot even be alluded to here we must refer the reader to the biographer. The work is, it need hardly be said, on the whole, attractively and in many places beautifully written. As illustrations of this the extracts given in the present paper will suffice. It is not perfectly even, the reason lies obviously in the extremely short time in which the volumes were produced.

The books are well indexed and the Appendix contains some interesting notes, amongst which is Benson's projected plan of a novel on the European War. One could wish that a complete list of his works had also been added. It would have been convenient for reference.

F. P. S.

LIFE OF REV. CHARLES NERINCKX, Pioneer Missionary of Kentucky and Founder of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross. By the Rev. W. J. Howlett. The Mission Press, S. V. D., Techny, Ill. 1916. Pp. 447.

Although several biographies of Father Nerinckx have long been before the public, notably one by Archbishop Spalding and another by Bishop Maes, there is, nevertheless, ample reason for the existence of the present more recent life. The ever-growing interest in the early history of the colonies, and among Catholics especially in the pioneer days of their Church, calls for a fresh and more critical study of the life of one who effected so far-reaching an influence on both civilization and religion as did the Apostle of Kentucky. Moreover, new documents relating to his life and labors have recently come to light which correct some erroneous notions concerning certain historical details. Father Howlett has utilized the fresh material to focus a fuller light on the personality of Father Nerinckx and thus to bring it out into relief from amidst the mass of events which constitute the general history of his place and times. Weaving the new knowledge with the old, the author gives us a fuller picture of Nerinckx the man, while the immense influence of the priest and the apostle is thereby all the more strongly exhibited. The distinction here emphasized, although an obvious one, ought not to be passed over too lightly.

While it is not universally true that the heroic virtue of the apostle is foreshadowed in the neophyte, no more than it is always the case that the boy is father to the man, nevertheless, grace *does* presuppose nature, and generally, if not universally, the promise of greatness of soul in the man is discernible in the tendencies and character of the youth. Sprung from a sturdy Flemish stock wherein mental culture blended with religious, the boy Charles Nerinckx was strong of body as he was of mind and heart. Of his parentage he could write: "I had the happiness of being born of religious parents and was the oldest in a family of seven brothers and seven sisters of whom the greatest number were blessed with a religious vocation, notwithstanding the interruptions and efforts of violent revolutions, all with the aim of destroying religion" (p. 26). A sound mind and heart in an unusually robust body were the strong natural basis upon which the grace of God reared the spiritual structure of a priest who, after a brief ministry in Belgium, in which severe trials and persecutions were the molding forces, came to the Catholic pioneers of Kentucky to preserve and propagate their faith.

Though Father Nerinckx was one of the humblest of men, it was his wont to set down in writing many of the minutest details of his

experiences. It is to this no doubt providential custom that we owe the knowledge both of his labors amongst the settlers of Kentucky and, what is hardly less valuable, the trials of his earlier priestly life. It was suffering and persecution from the revolutionists in Belgium that prepared him for his missionary work in the American colonies. It might be interesting to quote from the recently discovered writings in which Father Nerinckx describes some phases of his priestly life prior to his setting out for the Kentucky missions. The salient features of the story are so aptly suggested and the net outcome of this probation so succinctly put by his present biographer that a paragraph from the volume before us will serve our purpose better.

> The man who found a disorganized and almost irreligious parish, and made it a model of order and religious fervor, had the power of creating the means to an end, and the strength of perseverance to push them on to that end. The man who had borne the isolation of six years of concealment from the world, and resisted the temptation of liberty with an uneasy conscience, and had grown stronger under the double test, could bear the pain of exile and loneliness of the missionary. The man who regulated his spiritual and temporal affairs by rule could resist the moral temptations of the world; and the man who, in the activities of life when surrounded by abundance, could prescribe for himself the self-denial and sacrifice of "no breakfast all the year round, no meat in Advent and Lent, on Ember days, Rogation days, and on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays of the year", could bear the poverty and privations of the missions. The man who did the work of an apostle, suffered the persecutions of a martyr, and lived the life of a saint in Europe, could labor with success on a mission in America. Such a man was the Rev. Charles Nerinckx, and time would bring the power to express in words of a foreign tongue the knowledge with which his mind was stored. Yes, Father Nerinckx was equipped, and admirably equipped, for the American missions. (P. 76.)

It will not be necessary to follow Father Nerinckx into the field of those missions. The reader may already be acquainted with his labors therein and their results, or, if not, he will be amply repaid by making the acquaintance through the present biography. Nevertheless it may not be amiss to quote a page from one of Father Nerinckx's letters in which he tells with his wonted perfect simplicity a bit of missionary experience.

> We have some twenty-four missions to attend. The most remote church is sixty miles from here, but we are sometimes called as far as 180 miles in either direction. This does not happen often, thank God, but when it does happen I do not suffer from riding on horseback as I used to. Three hours in the saddle fatigued me very much; now I have traveled a hundred and fifty miles on horseback in two nights and one day, through bad roads and all kinds of weather, and I stood it better than I expected. My usual occupations during the week are as follows: On Sunday morning I am in the saddle at about four o'clock so as to reach one of my missions at about half-past six. I there find a crowd of people awaiting my coming to go to confession. We first say the prayers for morning and make a meditation. I then give them an instruction on the sacrament of penance and prepare them

for it. At intervals of half an hour, marked by the ringing of a bell from the sacristy where I am hearing confessions, one of the congregation, whom I myself designate, says the beads for a special intention already determined, and so on until about eleven o'clock when I vest for Mass. Before beginning the Holy Sacrifice I give a short address, and I preach after the reading of the Gospel. After Mass, during which the people usually sing some English hymns, I have the children pray for special intentions as I did at Meerbeek. The congregation is dismissed between one and two P. M., when I am ready for Baptisms and funerals, if there should be any. Seldom do I break my fast before four o'clock, unless to take a glass of water or milk, and it often happens that when I have had a bite someone is ready to take me twenty miles or more on a sick-call. Such is my order for Sundays and four of the six week days. I hear confessions every evening until seven, and in summer until eight or nine o'clock, so that I have to figure pretty closely to find time to say my Office. Frequently I give Communion as late as five P. M. to those who could not go to confession earlier and cannot wait until the next day.

As a fitting supplement to this page of personal experience may be attached another quoted by Father Howlett from the Life by Archbishop Spalding. One of the most striking traits of Father Nerinckx was his unequaled courage. "He feared no difficulties and was appalled by no dangers. Through rains and storms, through snow and ice, over roads almost impassable by the mud, over streams swollen by the rains or frozen by the cold, by day and by night, in winter and in summer, he might be seen traversing all parts of Kentucky in the discharge of his religious duties. Far from shunning, he seemed to seek after hardships and dangers." Like all great souls, he was most considerate of others. "He was averse to giving trouble to others, especially to the poor. Often when he arrived at a house in the night, he attended to his own horse, and took a brief repose in the stable or in some outhouse, and when the inmates of the house arose in the morning they frequently perceived him up already, and saying his Office or making his meditation. He made it an invariable rule never to miss an appointment whenever it was at all possible to keep it. He often arrived at a distant station early in the morning after having ridden all the previous night." His disposition was not effusive. "He seldom talked, except on business, on God, on virtue, or on his missionary duties. . . . If he seemed austere out of the confessional, in it he was a most kind, patient and tender father. He spared no time or pains to instruct his penitents, all of whom, without one exception, were deeply attached to him. To his instructions, chiefly in the confessional, are we to ascribe the piety and regularity of many among the living Catholics in Kentucky." Like his Divine Master he had a strong love for children. On them "he lavished his labor with the greatest relish. Thoroughly to instruct them and prepare them for their First Communion was his favorite employment. He thought no time or labor too long or ill-spent that was devoted to this favorite

object of his heart. For this purpose he usually remained a week at each of the churches and stations. During this time he had the children and servants daily assembled, and devoted his whole time to them. After Mass, he was in the habit of practising a devotion as beautiful as it was touching and impressive. He went to the centre of the church, where, surrounded by the little children, he knelt down, and with arms extended in the form of a cross—the little children also raising their arms in like manner—he recited prayers in honor of the Five Wounds of our Divine Saviour. The parents often joined the children in this moving devotion. After this he led his little congregation, composed chiefly of children, into the adjoining graveyard, where he caused them to pray over the graves of their deceased relatives and friends." Thus he laid the foundations of faith and charity deep in the souls of the little ones. No wonder then that "God blessed his labors with fruits so abundant and permanent as to console him for all his toils and privations. He witnessed a flourishing church growing up round him, in what had been recently a wilderness inhabited only by fierce wild beasts and untamable savages. He saw in the virtues of his scattered flock a revival of those virtues which had rendered so illustrious the Christians of the first ages of the Church."

These testimonials from one who knew him personally will suffice to show what manner of man and priest Father Nerinckx was. Should they direct the reader to the present biography they will have done more than serve the purpose for which they have been cited here.

TRACTATIONES TRES. I. De Censuris in Genere. II. De Censuris in Specie. III. In Constitutionem "Apostolicae Sedis," juxta recentiora decreta et juris dispositiones. P. Nicolaus Farrugia, Ord. S. Aug. Typis Johannis Muscat: Melitae. Pp. 212. 1916.

It is the aim of the writer in this treatise of two hundred pages on censures, not to present anything new on the subject, which, as he notes in his preface, has been discussed by many eminent theologians. It is his purpose, rather, while drawing freely from learned and approved authors, to review the various questions concerning censures in general and in particular and concerning those contained in the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis", in a simple style and in a lucid rather than elegant narrative.

Priests and theological students who desire to have a handy volume on the subject of censures apart from the usually bulky manuals of Moral Theology will find their wish satisfied in this work. It will

be found useful too inasmuch as it gives the latest legislation of the Roman Pontiffs and the most recent decisions of the Sacred Congregations with respect to censures.

The first part of the work, on censures in general, is divided into seven articles which treat of the notion and the division of censures; their author and subject; the conditions requisite to incur them; and the causes which excuse from incurring them; and finally, absolution from censure and the conditions required for absolution. In the second part of the work, on censures in particular, namely excommunication, suspension, and interdict, the writer has given a very satisfactory treatment, especially of excommunication and its effects. The third part of the work is devoted to the consideration of the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" issued by Pope Pius IX, 12 October, 1869. Of this document Slater in his *Manual of Moral Theology* says: "We may warn the reader that the document is legal and highly technical and that want of caution or knowledge may easily lead him to draw very wrong conclusions from the document". The writer of the treatise under review has striven earnestly to prevent his readers from drawing wrong conclusions from the document. He quotes the opening sentences of the Constitution, from which it is clear that censures "latae sententiae" are dealt with exclusively and that it is the purpose of the legislation to reduce the number of such censures, which in former times had gradually multiplied and some of which no longer served the end for which they were imposed. Before discussing the censures of the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" in detail, the writer gives an excellent brief explanation of the general content of the document. Following the statement of each censure there are copious clear notes. The commentary throughout is helpful and supported by the authority of the most notable canonists and moral theologians. The influence of the concise and accurate commentary on the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" issued in 1894 by D'Annibale is apparent in this valuable treatise of Father Farrugia.

W. H.

PLAIN SERMONS BY PRACTICAL PREACHERS. Original Sermons on the Gospels or Epistles of All the Sundays and the Principal Feasts. Joseph F. Wagner, New York. 1916. Vol. I, pp. 417; Vol. II, pp. 382.

The title selected for these two substantial volumes of sermons quite accurately describes their nature. They are plain in the good sense of the word, bent more on the direct and impressive presentation of

the matter than on mere oratorical effect, and using a language that will be readily understood by the average audience to which our pulpit addresses itself. They are by practical preachers, not unfamiliar with the needs of the day and experienced in the art of touching the hearts of the faithful; and, for this reason, they are eminently preachable and instinct with life. There is something decidedly unique about this collection; it comes not from a single pen, nor has it been gathered from forgotten tomes in dusty libraries. This, of course, is a double advantage. Such a variety in style, conception, and manner of handling the proposed subject will in turn appeal to a wide range of difficult tastes and answer to the requirements of all kinds of circumstances. The note of timeliness is evident in the character of the topics treated and in the way in which they are approached. Apologetic and social themes are conspicuous, and it is in these two directions that the pulpit in our days must face. The message of the Church, though essentially the same in all ages, yet adapts itself, in various ways, to the specific problems of each generation and to the crying needs of the time. It is very gratifying to note that the men whose pulpit utterances are here brought together, have felt the pulse of the time and the stir of the age in their own breasts and that they speak the word of God in modern terms.

The volumes cover all the Sundays and feasts of two years, and, incidentally, furnish ample material for discourses on various occasions. The priest who has them on his book-shelves commands a rich mine of homiletic wealth enabling him to meet the multiple demands of the sacred ministry. A topical index would make their vast stores of valuable information more accessible and their use less laborious.

MEAGHER OF THE SWORD. Speeches of Thomas Francis Meagher in Ireland, 1846–1848. Edited by Arthur Griffith. With a Preface, Appendices, Index and Illustrations. M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., Dublin. 1916. Pp. 373.

In *Meagher of the Sword* we have pure romance and the spirit of patriotism personified. Among the Young Ireland leaders he stands out as one of the most attractive and gallant figures. No patriot of nobler stamp and finer mold could be conceived. By his chivalry, generosity, and eloquence he inspired personal affection and won public confidence. His career, though brilliant and begun under promising auspices, failed of the highest achievement; it was meteor-like in its eventfulness and adventurous character. The end was tragic and mysterious.

His speeches are vehement outbursts of a native eloquence. They are the authentic expression of Irish Nationalism. In the light of

recent events, the following passage from the Secession Speech of 26 July, 1846, assumes a particular meaning: "I do not abhor the use of arms in the vindication of national rights. There are times when arms will alone suffice, and when political ameliorations call for a drop of blood, and many thousand drops of blood . . . Be it for the defence, or be it for the assertion of a nation's liberty, I look upon the sword as a sacred weapon."

The "Narrative of 1848" contains the most charming and intimate glimpses of Irish life and delightful revelations of Irish character. It shows how the embers of national aspirations were smoldering in every heart, and how a gentle breath would fan them to a mighty blaze. Until his death Meagher had hoped that he would be able to come to the rescue of his oppressed country; but, though he was baffled in his efforts, he never lost faith in Ireland's righteous cause and never doubted its final triumph. "God speed the Irish nation to liberty and power", was the last prayer written by Meagher of the Sword. The narrative of the penal voyage to Tasmania and the recollections of Waterford abound in soul-stirring incidents and in bright touches of humor.

THE PASSION AND DEATH OF JESUS. By the Rev. Philip Coghlan, O.P. Benziger Bros., New York. 1916. Pp. 140.

MEDITATIONS ON THE MYSTERIES OF OUR HOLY FAITH. Based on the Work of the Venerable Louis de Ponte, S. J. By the Rev. C. W. Barraud, S. J. Benziger Bros., New York. 1916. Vol. I, pp. 417. Vol. II, pp. 351.

It is a matter for regret that the first of these two books failed to reach the REVIEW in time for notice in the April number. The work is, as the title shows, a help for the soul in Passiontide. However, the Passion ought never be separated from the spiritual life at any part of the ecclesiastical cycle, so that a book of the kind can never be wholly untimely even in the season when the darkness of Good Friday has melted into the splendors of Easter and the glories of Pentecost have lengthened into the sequences of Trinity. There are of course many books that treat of our Lord's Passion—some that restate the Gospel narratives or blend them into a connected harmony; others that dwell upon the details of the Divine Tragedy and suggest to the meditative soul apt thoughts and affection. That there is a book quite like the one before us is doubtful. And yet it can hardly be called an original work. This goes without the saying. Still, as one reads it, the familiar story gives forth an unexpected newness, freshness, vividness. The author visualizes the Passion in

its entirety and sets it forth continuously, "not overburdened with reflections nor interrupted with digressions". Not the words but the thoughts of the Evangelists are given, together with such inferences and conclusions as flow legitimately and naturally from them; and such sidelights of topography and such insights of exegetes as serve to bring forth the actuality as well as the unrevealed depth of the Gospel narrative. The book is not so much a manual of meditation (though it will serve this purpose) as it is an introduction to an intelligent comprehension of the Passion as a whole.

Comparatively few souls, especially neophytes in the art of meditation, can get along without a manual of some kind. They need to have the plan, method, points, the entire apparatus, before their eyes or within easy reach of the hand. There is of course no scarcity of helps of this kind. But probably, out of the large number, there is none more generally serviceable than the *Meditationes* of the great Spanish Jesuit, Father Luis de la Puente. In these meditations, solidity of doctrine and learning are permeated with a fervent devotional spirit. Versions of it exist in French and German, as well as Spanish. The two volumes above are an adaptation of De Ponte's well-known work. Though condensed, it retains the methodical plan of the original. The "points" are brief, but full of meat. They flow naturally from the mystery under consideration and suggest personal reflection and application. A distinctive feature is the appendix of prayers and hymns intended to furnish material for "the colloquies" of the individual meditations. It is a serviceable manual for the busy priest. Not its least merit is the large letter-press which makes it legible even under the faint rays of a tallow dip "et oculis etiam obcaecantibus".

YONDER? By the Rev. T. Gavan Duffy, P.F.M. The Devin-Adair Co., New York. 1916. Pp. 170.

On the upper half of the front cover of this volume is stamped in gold an outline map of the Far East—India, China, the Philippines; and across this vast expanse of missionary territory stands out in red the questioning title—*Yonder?* To one who sees so much of the book its subject-matter is therefore no longer matter of wonder, however much the enigmatic title may be a puzzle to others. And there is good reason, no doubt, for keeping one's hand under cover, so to say, when the business afoot is the enlistment of interest and of recruits for the missions of the field afar. *One* of the explanations, it may be, of the shyness or apathy toward the work of Christianizing our brothers in foreign lands is to be found in the

general lack of enterprise in the literature of the foreign missions. Their story has a deep human interest, not to mention its religious appeal; but in order to win attention it needs to be set forth in a garb both attractive and varied, in a literary style that is pleasing and addressed to our own day and country, and in a tasteful letter-press and make-up. These features characterize and commend Father Gavan Duffy's new volume.

The titles of the three unequal parts into which it falls give a good general notion of the ground covered—1. "Quis ibit nobis?"; 2. "Ecce ego, mitte me"; 3. "Et dixit, vade". Five short chapters make up the first division, and the headings, oddly enough, are —"The Dawn"; "First Blood"; "Himself"; "Sisters"; "Crows". As they stand thus baldly, these chapter headings are not very enlightening, but as one reads there is opened up an avenue of thought in a region still untrod; and one is led naturally to ask himself whether he is doing his share of knowing, loving, helping, going *Yonder*. There is a fascination in the story as here told by one who, in the ardor of youth, has known the romantic spell of the great plan of carrying salvation to the heathen in the Far East, and who knows now how the romance is ruthlessly disspelled by the prosaic life and dull round of trials amid an apathetic, superstitious, pagan people; but by one who, having got his second breath, as it were, is again under the spell of Yonder, which, after all, is not India, but Heaven—Heaven via India and the Fart East. All this is graphically depicted in the recital of a series of incidents that are skilfully interwoven. Throughout the book there are many passages that would bear quoting, for instance, the following—

> That our parishes would never suffer from an increased zeal in the broader interests of the Universal Church is a consoling paradox which it is well to emphasize. It is not a question of jealously husbanding resources; it is rather a question of arousing in the hearts of our people that unfathomable religious spirit which is too often allowed to lie dormant—that spirit which measures its generosity, not by the size of another's contribution, but by the unlimited extent of the need.

The following incident, on hearing the confessions of these poor people, is also of interest:

> That evening Father Nayagam had his first experience with neophytes in the confessional; he emerged a century older. The sensation was like that of coming down a steep staircase in the dark; and it was a staircase of fifty flights, and the steps were rickety and broken, sometimes cut away altogether, and irregular in height and intervals—and no banister at all.

Throughout the volume there are many quaint conceits and a genuine humor at play. Readers of the REVIEW will be well repaid by its perusal.

By way of postscript, it is not out of place to recall here that the author is the son of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, the centenary of whose birth fell in the spring of this year and has been allowed to pass so far unnoticed, doubtless owing to the preoccupations of a world at war. Otherwise a career so remarkable and full of interest for Catholics would have received the commemoration it deserves. Though he had stood before ten of the twelve judges in Ireland to answer charges of treason, he was finally acquitted. In 1856 he sailed to Australia, and became Prime Minister of Victoria in 1871. The London *Spectator* on that occasion said of him: "If anybody wishes to know what the Empire loses by English inability to conciliate Irish affection, let him read the speech addressed by Mr. Gavan Duffy, the new Premier of Victoria, to his constituents. It contains the program of the new government he has formed in Melbourne, and we have not for years read a political manifesto so full of character and power. Mr. Duffy is an Irishman, a Catholic, and a rebel, a typical man of the class which we English say can neither govern nor be governed; but he speaks like a man for whom the Tories are sighing, the born administrator, utterly free of flummery or buncombe, clear as to his end, clearer still as to his means, ready to compromise anything except principle, but giving even to compromise an expression of original force." He was a shining mark for the shafts of religious bigotry, but he never dipped his Catholic colors.

THE SPIRIT OF MAN. An Anthology in English and French from the Philosophers and Poets made by the Poet Laureate. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1916.

The best anthology would be that which one should gather together from his own reading and searching. The "thoughts" thus collected would have a personal appeal and would accord with one's instinctive appreciation of value, whether of intellectual truth, moral virtue, or some type or form of beauty. Not all even cultivated readers have, however, either time, opportunity, or ability to construct a work of this kind. Most will have to depend for their treasuries of selected thoughts upon the stock compilations to be found in the book marts. The worth of these collections is extremely variable and uncertain. What will be found in them to suit the taste of one person will make no appeal to or may repel another. And not infrequently the seeker for gems of the mind is unrewarded for his pains —returns empty-handed or the bearer of commonplace pebbles.

The present anthology, compiled by the poet laureate of England, possesses in its very authorship credentials of excellence; and a

glance through its pages suffices to confirm this *a priori* presumption. It should be noted, however, that the work is not constructed on the familiar lines of anthologies. It is not an alphabetically indexed catalogue of quotations illustrative of all manner of subjects; rather is it an ensemble of manifold and multiform lights playing upon a central idea, the spirit of man, the idea that "spirituality is the basis of human life rather than its apex, that man is a spiritual being and the proper work of his mind is to interpret the world according to his higher nature and to conquer the material aspects of the world so as to bring them into subjection to his spirit". The "thoughts", gathered together from a great variety of worthy sources, are intended therefore to be looked at in their convergence upon this central idea. Hence the author's laconic invitation to his readers that they "bathe and not fish in these waters". Bearing in mind that the unity of the plan is not meant to convey a logical thesis, but to show forth the conjoining play of many souls, one may not form a just estimate of the work by pouncing upon a thought here and there and holding it up for inspection. That would be angling. One must immerse oneself in the waters, be wholly in them and feel their spiritual buoyancy. That is bathing. Under the process of such experience the power and the beauty of the collection can hardly fail to make themselves felt and appreciated.

On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that a work of the kind, emanating from a non-Catholic mind, will not possess the precision and definiteness of thought to which our philosophy and theology, together with our faith, make us accustomed. The subjective *mood* is apt to prevail over the objective definition and distinction in many of the selections. Nevertheless, to the Catholic mind "omnia co-operantur in bonum". It knows how to mold and shape by its own inherited or acquired categories whatever of genuine truth or of real beauty comes within its reach. The molding and shaping processes do not change the substance of either. They do but fulfil the first function of the wise man: "Sapientis est ordinare seu ordinem ponere in rebus".

Literary Chat.

We have more than once had occasion to call attention to the signal merit of the dissertations presented to the Faculty of the Catholic University at Washington in fulfilment of the requirements for academic honors. It is a pleasure to extend the same praise, though we are doing it somewhat belated, to two such dissertations pertinent to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The first deals with the question of *Minimum Wage*. In a pamphlet of 140 pages the author, Father O'Grady, presents a clear summary of the wage problem from the rise of the medieval gilds down to our own day. He also gives a survey of the trend of wage legislation, particularly in England, New Zealand, Victoria, and in various commonwealths of the United States. There are of course not a few objections against such legislation. Dr. O'Grady discusses them, and deems none of them conclusive. On the other hand, a canvass made by him of the opinion of professional economists on the subject reveals the fact that, though not enthusiastic as to the marvelous results prognosticated by its Utopian advocates, American economists "do not show the same unreasoned opposition toward minimum wage legislation as do the ordinary business men whose interests are immediately affected" (p. 131). Dr. O'Grady's dissertation is a meritorious contribution to the literature of a subject which thus far, outside of Dr. Ryan's *A Living Wage*, contains comparatively little of a systematic nature, though there is no dearth of published material.

Classification of Desires in St. Thomas and in Modern Sociology is the title of the other dissertation alluded to above. Students of psychology know how vague and uncertain are the classifications of feelings given by modern writers on the subject. The reason of the uncertainty is of course the lack of philosophical foundations. On the other hand, the classification given by St. Thomas following Aristotle, while not as detailed and concrete as might be desired, has at least the merit of being based on certain adequate principles. In the dissertation just mentioned the author, Father Henry Smith, O.P., summarizes the classification of desires arranged by the Angelic Doctor, and compares them with those made by the best known recent sociologists, Ward and Small. Though brief, the analysis is clear and suggestive. The pamphlet has an ethical and sociological as well as a psychological value.

A bouquet of pretty stories is envased in the neat, quaintly pictured booklet *Seven Fairy Tales* from the Portuguese and the Spanish. The translator's name is not given, but the publishers are Benziger Brothers (New York). Fairy tales are for children flowers that grow quickly into wholesome fruits. For grown-ups they are or ought to be fruits nutritious because delicious. A priest whose imagination is alert for things old as well as new knows how to win the fairies, or at least the stories concerning them, into the service of truth. The little tale entitled "Maria Sabida"—the sixth in the present septenary—the maiden who knew everything except what was best for herself, lends itself readily to such ennoblement.

No ordinary mortal expects to keep abreast with the stream of war books which never stops flowing from the press. They already fill a small reservoir and the supply shows no sign of ceasing. Most of this literature is probably ephemeral. Some of it will of course endure. Amongst the more notable contributions is the "International Series of Books on the Great War", issued by the Open Court Publishing Company (Chicago, Illinois). Five volumes are at present on the list: *Justice in War Time* is a strong "appeal to intellectuals", by the Hon. Bertrand Russell (Trinity College, Cambridge); *Above the Battle*, by Robert Rolland, appeals to the youth of the world "to

declare a strike against war"; *Carlyle and the War* comes next; *Germany Misjudged* is "an appeal to international good will", by Roland Hugins (Cornell University); *Belgium and Germany* presents "a neutral Dutch view of the war"; the author is Dr. Labberton; the translator William Leonard. All these books manifest a real tendency to be just. They appear to be conceived in the interests more of humanity than of nationality.

The relative influences of "nature and nurture" upon development—directly organic and indirectly spiritual—will always present a field fertile in endless opportunities for debate. As no even urban, not to say rustic, referee has ever ventured to decide the rival claims for superior mightiness between the pen and the sword, so no umpire will presume to determine which is the winner in the race for glory, nature or nurture; or, to give the contestants their biological nomenclature, "heredity" or "environment".

Some onlookers at the game of life will prefer to cry—may we say "root"?—for heredity. It's blood that counts every time. Others will shout for environment. It all depends on your "raisin'". On the side of the former Sir Francis Galton's voice is heard the loudest. In his *Hereditary Genius* (London, 1869) he made out a strong if not a convincing claim for nature, as against nurture; while in more recent times Mr. Lester Ward, in his *Applied Sociology* (Boston, 1906), has ably, though not more convincingly, maintained the prepotence of nurture over nature. Probably the two opponents implicitly agree in fundamentals. They differ in that, each defending his own thesis sees and emphasizes beyond the other the special agency upon which he has riveted his thought. Both nature and nurture are of course essential factors of development and it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to assign to one or the other its proportional influence.

The problem has been given a very fine sifting in a recent issue of the Columbia University *Studies* bearing the title *American Men of Letters*, Their Nature and Nurture, by Edwin Clarke, Ph.D. The author's study is a most interesting one as well as instructive. Minutely inductive, it bristles with facts and figures. The statistics, however, are not trees that hide the woods. They are luminous and reflect the inferences clear and distinct.

One of the environmental factors of literary development is of course religion. In the table which exhibits the influence of early religious training during the century prior to 1850 we find the number of men of letters accredited to the Congregational denomination 119, to the Presbyterian 73, to the Protestant Episcopal 53, and so on till we reach the ninth place where we find 16 accredited to the Catholic religion. The discrepancy between the latter figure and the first is not to be explained solely by Catholic poverty, nor even by the fact "that Protestants enjoyed greater freedom of thought" (p. 82). The relative minority of Catholics must not be forgotten, or the fact that most of the educational institutions were practically closed to them. Moreover, it should be remembered that in those days no less than at any other time a Catholic writer is usually from the standpoint of fame at a disadvantage; for either he writes on subjects more or less Catholic, and then his readers will be almost exclusively those of his own Church, or on secular topics, and then he has frequently, if not always, to confront the prejudice that nothing worth while can come out of Nazareth. It did not, of course, fall within Professor Clarke's scope to enter into these explanations (Longmans, Green & Co., New York).

A recent collection of short stories by Fr. Fitzgerald, O.F.M., appears under the title *A Good Third*. The significance of the title is not apparent. At any rate, more than "a third" of the stories is "good"; or rather not simply a fraction but the integer is good—with lots of Celtic humor in them; clever,

and on the whole well, that is colloquially, and therefore aptly, told. (Gill & Son, Dublin.)

A pretty story, pathetic and touched with the tang of the sea is *Little Donald*, by Mrs. Innes-Browne. It is told by "grannie dear" to the children, who evidently follow little Donald with bated breath as he drifts over the sea, in the frail boat; and rejoice with him as he is rescued from death in the offing and restored to his castle home whence he had been kidnapped. A story which most children will like to read. (Benziger Bros., New York.)

A book that might advantageously be introduced into the English course of our colleges, and also our preparatory seminaries, is *The Brief*, with Selections for Briefing, by Carroll Lewis Maxcy, M.A. It treats of both legal and argumentative briefs, gives examples of briefing, faulty and correct, and a collection of notable orations by eminent statesmen—models for study and proportionately for imitation. It would be hard to find a better instrument for developing the student's power of analysis, orderly arrangement, and clear straightforward expression of his thoughts. A seminarian drilled by work such as is here set forth would be well prepared to enter upon the study of scholastic logic. It is just the lack of this kind of preparedness that makes the latter study so difficult and unattractive. (Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston.)

There is, also, a human side to the war. The irrepressible humor that lies deep in the human breast, wells up occasionally and comes to the surface to keep things wholesome, and to afford the men that become familiar with the ghastly sights of wholesale death a brief and much-needed surcease from the horrors of their environment. Such brighter glimpses, that light up the gloom of trench life, have been collected in two interesting volumes by the Volksvereinsverlag in M. Gladbach (*Heimatgruesse an unsere Krieger 1915; Kriegsallerlei 1916*). There is something very refreshing and reassuring about these volumes; they show that nothing can efface the genial and sweet instincts of humanity in the soldier's heart, and that the war does not succeed in blunting these fine and delicate sentiments.

The Volksvereinsverlag does not confine its activity to the production of war literature. In these turbulent times it gives us a delightful character sketch of a most peaceful and amiable man, Alban Stolz, Germany's most popular Catholic author (*Alban Stolz*. Von Herman Herz. 1916.). The influence for good of this quaint and eccentric writer cannot be calculated; to him is largely due the Catholic revival in Germany after the Kulturkampf. He was a genuine poet, though he wrote no verse. This new biography will undoubtedly enlarge the circle of his friends.

The poet's mind is the mirror of the universe. Everything becomes transfigured when kindled by the divine glow of his creative imagination. Even the battlefields blossom forth into beauty when the breath of his inspiration touches them. His hand culls brilliant flowers on the brink of the grave and wreathes with motley garlands the mouth of the cannon. Many a poem has been inspired by the present great world conflict. Two collections of war poems lie before us (A. L. McGreevy, *The God of Battles and Other Verses*. Boston: Sherman, French & Co., 1915. Heinrich Zerkaulen, *Wandlung*. Volksvereinsverlag, M. Gladbach.). The former, as the title suggests, strikes other notes besides war notes; its inspiration is mainly religious and patriotic. There are fine lines vibrating with passion and rich in musical qualities. In most of the poems, however, reflection predominates and stifles the artistic inspiration. The second is more realistic. Its accents are more piercing and in its rhymes we hear in echo the rumblings of the war. The deep pathos and the terrible tragedy of war are evident on every page, and some of

the cadences seem to have been penned to the rhythm of flowing tears and heart-rending groans.

The publishing house of Bloud et Gay is untiring in its efforts for the literary defence of the French cause. One would think that the French case had been put before public opinion squarely and fairly by this time, and that nothing remained to be said in its favor. Yet the acute French mind detects something new every day which makes the innocence of France appear clearer and brighter. We can only mention these publications and must leave it to the reader to judge of their merits. (H. Lichtenberger, *L'Opinion Americaine et la Guerre;* M. de Sorgues, *Les Catholiques espagnols et la Guerre;* R. Perret, *L'Allemagne, les Neutres et le Droit des Gens;* Comte Begouen, *La Guerre Actuelle devant la Conscience Catholique.*)

Rendez-nous les Sœurs! is a plea for the return of the religious sisters to France. The appeal of this brief is the stronger because it comes from the pen of medical men and is based chiefly upon broad arguments of humanity and expediency. It will be read with profit in our own country, because here also the attacks on the activity of the religious orders are multiplying and beginning to assume a bitter virulence. This little pamphlet marshals before us an array of well-authenticated facts which speak volumes in favor of the humble and devoted nuns ("Conférences et Documents sur la réintégration des religeuses dans les hôpitaux." Par les Drs. L. et P. Murat. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris.)

The movement in favor of temperance is spreading and gaining momentum; countries that seemed beyond its reach are drawn into its powerful eddies. From French Canada we receive a vigorous indictment of the drink evil and a strong denunciation of the ravages it produces in society (Mgr. J. M. Emard, *Messages.* Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin.). The exposition is very clear and in the best French style. The eminent author expects a change for the better only from moral agencies, especially through education and enlightenment. These messages furnish splendid material for temperance addresses. From the same pen comes a practical and very useful study on the actual legislation concerning the eucharistic fast (*Le Jeune Eucharistique*).

If anyone enjoys ready repartee and tart humor, let him read *Neutrality* by S. Ivor Stephen. (*Neutrality.* The Crucifixion of Public Opinion. From the American Point of View. Chicago: The Neutrality Press.) The clever author mercilessly lets in the light on much of the cant of our press and recalls to our memory many inconvenient facts which we prefer to forget. He draws his illustrations from a seemingly inexhaustible store of historical knowledge. Caustic wit and biting satire season every line.

The French clergy has always been very zealous for the glory of the Blessed Mother. They have sung her praises in many and beautiful strains. Neither can the war silence the voices of her devoted children. L'abbé P. L. Perroy has found time to present us with a very substantial volume of meditations on the virtues of the Blessed Virgin. (*L'Humble Vierge Marie.* Paris: P. Lethielleux). He lays special stress on her humility and lowliness; and, rightly so, for humility is the cornerstone of the edifice of perfection. The meditations are based on a sound exegesis and on a thorough practical knowledge of the human heart. The diction in which they are couched reminds one of the great models of French eloquence and at times has a truly lyrical ring.

Marie et les Éprouvés de la Guerre (Par R. Portehault. Paris: Lethielleux.) is a book of meditations and prayers, destined to bring cheer and comfort to those who have been tried in the fire of tribulation. It abounds in lofty

sentiments and inspiring thoughts, well calculated to soothe the grief-stricken heart and to sweeten the tears of distress. It is, however, marred by uncalled for and unseemly vilifications of the enemy, which certainly have nothing to do with devotion and piety.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

PLAIN SERMONS BY PRACTICAL PREACHERS. Original Sermons on the Gospels or Epistles of all the Sundays and the Principal Feasts. Two volumes. Joseph F. Wagner, New York. 1916. Pp. 417 and 382. Price, $3.00 *net.*

THE MIRROR OF JUSTICE. Chapters on Our Blessed Lady. By Robert Eaton, Priest of the Birmingham Oratory. (*Stella Maris Series.* Edited by the Rev. Edmund Lester, S.J.) Benziger Bros., New York. 1916. Pp. 144. Price, $0.35; $0.40 *postpaid.*

IN MEMORY OF OUR DEAD. By Herbert Thurston, S.J. Burns & Oates, London; B. Herder, St. Louis. 1916. Pp. 246. Price, $0.80.

THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. By F. A. Forbes. (*Standard Bearers of the Faith Series.*) R. & T. Washbourne, London; B. Herder, St. Louis. 1916. Pp. 126. Price, $0.30.

ST. CATHERINE OF SIENA. Her Life and Times. By C. M. Antony, O.S.D., author of *St. Dominic's Country,* etc. Edited by Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P., with a Preface by Fr. Thomas Schwertner, O.P. Burns & Oates, London; B. Herder, St. Louis. 1916. Pp. 280. Price, $1.80.

A CONFERENCE TO RELIGIOUS ENGAGED IN CARING FOR THE SICK. By the Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.SS.R. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1916. Pp. 12. Price, $0.10.

PROGRÉS DE L'AME DANS LA VIE SPIRITUELLE. Par le R. P. Frederic-William Faber, Docteur en Théologie, Superieur de l'Oratoire Sainte-Philippe de Néri de Londres. Traduit de l'anglais par M. F. de Bernhardt avec l'autorisation spéciale de l'auteur. Ouvrage approuvé par Mgr. l'Archevêque de Paris et par Mgr. l'Évêque de Nancy. Nouvelle édition. Pierre Téqui, Paris; Librairie Granger et Librairie Notre-Dame, Montreal; Librairie Garneau, Quebec. 1916. Pp. 504. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50.

LEUR AME EST IMMORTELLE. Par M. l'Abbé Pierre Lelièvre, Aumônier Volontaire aux Armées. Perrin & Cie, Paris. 1916. Pp. 181. Prix, 2 *fr.* 50.

A JÉSUS PAR MARIE, ou La Parfaite Dévotion à la Sainte Vierge enseignée par le B. Grignion de Montfort. Par M. l'Abbé J.-M. Texier, Directeur du *Règne de Jésus par Marie.* Pierre Téqui, Paris; Librairie Granger et Librairie Notre-Dame, Montreal; Librairie Garneau, Quebec. 1916. Pp. ix-415. Prix, 1 *fr.* 50.

JÉSUS EN CROIX, ou La Science du Crucifix en Forme de Méditations. Par les Pères Pierre Marie et Jean-Nicolas Grou, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Nouvelle édition revue par le P. Alphonse Cardès, de la même Compagnie, et augmentée de divers Exercices de Dévotion. Pierre Téqui, Paris; Librairie Granger et Librairie Notre-Dame, Montreal; Librairie Garneau, Quebec. 1916. Pp. xv-236. Prix, 1 *fr.*

AUX JEUNES. Discours prononcé en l'Église Métropolitaine de Notre-Dame sous la Présidence de S. E. le Cardinal Amette, Archevêque de Paris,

le Dimanche 14 Mai 1916. Par A.-D. Sertillanges, Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Comité Général de l'Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Française ou P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1916. Pp. 20. Prix, 0 *fr.* 50. (Se vend au profit de l'Association et de ses œuvres de guerre.)

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WANG YANG-MING. Translated from the Chinese by Frederick Goodrich Henke, Ph.D. (Chicago), Professor of Philosophy and Education in Allegheny College, formerly Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in the University of Nanking. Introduction by James H. Tufts, Ph. D., LL.D., Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy in the University of Chicago. Open Court Publishing Co., London and Chicago. 1916. Pp. 512. Price, $2.50.

THE VENUS OF MILO. An Archeological Study of the Goddess of Womanhood. By Paul Carus. Illustrated. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago and London. 1916. Pp. 182. Price, $1.00.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF POSITIVISM: A Selection of Articles from the *Positivist Review*, in Science, Philosophy, Religion, and Politics. By John Henry Bridges, M.B., F.R.C.P., Sometime Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and Medical Metropolitan Inspector to the Local Government Board. With a Preface by Edward Spencer Beesly. A new edition enlarged and classified. Edited by H. Gordon Jones. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago. 1915. Pp. xiii-480. Price, $1.50.

THE BUTTER INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES. An Economic Study of Butter and Oleomargarine. By Edward Wiest, Ph.D., Instructor in Economics at the University of Vermont. (Vol. 69, No. 2, of *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.* Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) Columbia University Press, Longmans, Green & Co., New York; P. S. King & Son, London. Pp. 262. Price, $2.00.

PRIVATE JUDGMENT. By the Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL.D. Edited by John J. Quinn, Ph.D. Diederich-Schaefer Co., Milwaukee. Pp. 53.

THE ATHENAEUM. Subject Index to Periodicals. 1915. Issued at the Request of the Council of the Library Association. History, Geography, Anthropology, and Folk-Lore. The Athenaeum, London; B. F. Stevens & Brown, New York. 1916. Pp. 32. Price, 1/6 *net.*

ALDHELMIANA. Studio critico letterario su Aldhelmo di Sherborne (+ 709). Dott. Donato Mazzoni, S.J. (*Rivista Storica Benedettina.*) Santa Maria Nuova, Roma. 1916. Pp. 80. Prezzo, 2 *fr.*

ESTRATTO DAL "DIDASKALEION". Studi Filologici di letteratura cristiana antica. (Anno III, Fasc. II, Aprile-Giugno 1914.) Direttore Paolo Ubaldi. Libreria Editrice Internazionale, Torino. Pp. 8.

AMERICAN MEN OF LETTERS: THEIR NATURE AND THEIR NURTURE. By Edwin Leavitt Clarke, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology, Hamilton College, etc.—New York: Columbia University. (Vol. 72, num. 1, of Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Columbia University.)—Longmans, Green & Co. (London: P. S. King & Son). 1916. Pp. 169. Price, $1.50.

STATE REGULATION OF RAILROADS IN THE SOUTH. By Maxwell Ferguson, A.M., LL.B., Sometime Fellow Polit. Science, Columbia University; Instructor in Economics, Vassar College.—New York: Columbia University. (Vol. 67, num. 2, of Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.)—Longmans, Green & Co. (London: P. S. King & Son). 1916. Pp. 228. Price, $1.75.

LITURGICAL.

MANUAL OF CATHOLIC HYMNS. For Schools, Choirs and Congregational Singing. Text and Melodies of a Collection of English and Latin Hymns for All Occasions, including also Gregorian Masses, a Unison Mass, a Requiem Mass, Funeral Services, Vespers, Responses, Benediction Service, and Litanies. Compiled and arranged by the Rev. B. Dieringer, Organist and Professor of Music at the Seminary of St. Francis, St. Francis, Wisconsin, and the Rev. Joseph J. Pierron, Graduate Ratisbon Royal School of Church Music, Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Lodi, Wisconsin. Benziger Brothers, New York. 1916. Pp. 178.

HISTORICAL.

THE LIFE OF MONSIGNOR ROBERT HUGH BENSON. By C. C. Martindale, S.J., author of *The Goddess of Ghosts*, etc. In two volumes. With illustrations. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1916. Pp. xvii-401 and 479. Price, $5.00 *net*.

THE ORIGINS OF THE ISLAMIC STATE. Being a Translation from the Arabic accompanied with annotations, geographic and historic notes, of the Kitab Futuh Al-Buldan of al-Iman abul Abbas Ahmad ibn-Jabir al-Baladhuri. By Philip Khuri Hitti, Ph.D., on the Permanent Staff of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut, Syria; Gustav Gottheil, Lecturer in Columbia University. Vol. I. (Vol. 68 of *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.* Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) Columbia University Press, Longmans, Green & Co., New York; P. S. King & Son, London. 1916. Pp. 518. Price, $4.00.

HISTORY OF THE DIOCESE OF FERNS. By W. H. Grattan Flood, Mus.D., National University of Ireland. Downey & Co., Waterford. 1916. Pp. 246.

LIVES OF THE CANADIAN MARTYRS. Five pamphlets by E. J. Devine, S.J. (*Canadian Messenger Series.*) No. 1, *John de Brébeuf, Apostle of the Hurons, 1593-1649.* No. 2, *Gabriel Lalemant, Victim of the Iroquois, 1610-1649.* No. 3, *Anthony Daniel, Victim of the Iroquois, 1598-1648.* No. 4, *Charles Garnier, Victim of the Iroquois, 1605-1649.* No. 5, *Noël Chabanel, Missionary in Huronia, 1613-1649.* Canadian Messenger, Montreal. 1916. Pp. 24 each. Price, $0.05 each.

STUDIES IN TUDOR HISTORY. By W. P. M. Kennedy, M.A., F.R.Hist.S., St. Michael's College, Toronto University, Canada, author of *A Life of Parker, Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, etc. Constable & Co., London. 1916. Pp. 340.

MEAGHER OF THE SWORD. Speeches of Thomas Francis Meagher in Ireland, 1846-1848. His Narrative of Events in Ireland in July, 1848. Personal Reminiscences of Waterford, Galway, and his school days. Edited by Arthur Griffith. With a Preface, Appendices, Index, and illustrations. M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin; B. Herder, St. Louis. 1916. Pp. 352. Price, $1.10.

MEMOIRS OF SISTER MARY OF MERCY KERUEL. Religious of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, 1880-1910. Taken from the French Life published at Angers, 1913. By M. A. M. Sands & Co., London; B. Herder, St. Louis. 1916. Pp. 203. Price, $1.10.

"PAGES ACTUELLES", 1914-1915: No. 1. *Le Soldat de 1914.* Le Salut aux Chefs. Par René Doumic, de l'Académie française. Pp. 38. No. 2. *Les Femmes et la Guerre de 1914.* Par Frédéric Masson, de l'Académie française. Cet opuscule est vendu au profit des blessés de l'Hôpital de l'Institut. Pp. 40. No. 26. *L'Opinion Catholique et la Guerre.* Par P. Imbart de la Tour, de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques. Suivi d'une Lettre de Don Miguel de Unamuno, Recteur de l'Université de Salamanque. Pp. 63.

No. 27. *La Charité et la Guerre.* Tableaux et Croquis. Par G. Lechartier. Pp. 64. No. 36. *L'Opinion Américaine et la Guerre.* Par Henri Lichtenberger. Pp. 63. No. 44. *Les Catholiques espagnols et la Guerre.* Par Maurice de Sorgues. Pp. 79. No. 65. *La Reine Élisabeth.* Par Maurice des Ombiaux. Pp. 64. No. 68. *L'Allemagne, les Neutres et le Droit des Gens.* Par Robert Perret, Docteur ès lettres. Pp. 64. No. 23. *En Guerre.* Impressions d'un témoin. Par Ferdinand de Brinon, Rédacteur au *Journal des Débats.* Pp. 77. No. 25. *La France au-dessus de tout.* Lettres de Combattants rassemblées et précédées d'une Introduction. Par Raoul Narsy, Rédacteur au *Journal des Débats.* Pp. 72. No. 29. *Contre les Maux de la Guerre.* Action Publique et Action Privée. Par Henri Joly, de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques. Pp. 47. No. 52. *La Conduite des Armées allemandes en Belgique et en France d'après l'Enquête anglaise.* Par Henri Davignon. Pp. 40. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1916. Prix, 0 *fr.* 60 par volume.

La Guerre en Picardie. Par M. l'Abbé Charles Calippe. Préface de S. G. Mgr. de la Villerabel, Évêque d'Amiens. Pierre Téqui, Paris; Librairie Granger et Librairie Notre-Dame, Montreal; Librairie Garneau, Quebec. 1916. Pp. xii-392. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50.

Pour la Victoire. Nouvelles Consignes de Guerre. Par Mgr. J. Tissier, Évêque de Chalôns. Pierre Téqui, Paris; Librairie Granger et Librairie Notre-Dame, Montreal; Librairie Garneau, Quebec. 1916. Pp. 369. 3 *fr.* 50.

La Guerre en Champagne. Au Diocèse de Chalôns (Septembre 1914-Septembre 1915.) Sous la direction de Monseigneur Tissier, Évêque de Chalôns. Pierre Téqui, Paris; Librairie Granger et Librairie Notre-Dame, Montreal; Librairie Garneau, Quebec. 1916. Pp. viii-525. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50.

Souvenirs d'un Réfugié. Douai, Lille, Paris, Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1914-1915. Par Léon Wastelier du Parc. Perrin & Cie., Paris. Pp. ix-323. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Seven Fairy Tales. From the Portuguese and the Spanish. Illustrated. By L. S. Benziger Bros., New York. 1916. Pp. 89. Price, $0.30; $0.35 *postpaid.*

Little Donald. By Mrs. Innes-Browne, author of *Three Daughters of the United Kingdom, A Garland of Everlasting Flowers,* etc. Illustrated by F. Ross Maguire. Benziger Bros., New York. 1916. Pp. xiii-156. Price, $0.75; $0.80 *postpaid.*

A Good Third. By the Rev. T. A. Fitzgerald, O.F.M., author of *Homespun Yarns* and *Fits and Starts.* M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. 1916. Pp. 255. Price, $1.10.

The Brief. With Selections for Briefing. By Carroll Lewis Maxcy, M.A., Morris Professor of Rhetoric in Williams College, author of *The Rhetorical Principles of Narration* and *Representative Narrative.* Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1916. Pp. 332. Price, $1.25 *net.*

Tobacco Habit Easily Conquered. How to do it agreeably and without drugs. With Appendix, "Tobacco, the Destroyer". By M. MacLevy, author of *Back of Life,* and *The MacLevy System of Dumbbell Training.* Compiler of Special Courses in Physical Culture for Numerous Institutions. Expert in Physical Efficiency. Albro Society, Inc., New York. 1916. Pp. 157. Price, $1.25 *net.*